STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,stks 205Ev13
Lutheran quarterly.
v.9 1879 Lutheran quarterly
0 0001 00658512 7

REFERENCE

COLLECTIONS

04-79-764-3

STATE LIBRARY
HARRISBURG,
PENNSYLVANIA

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

EDITED BY

J. A. BROWN, D. D.,

WITH THE SPECIAL COÖPERATION OF

M. VALENTINE, D. D.

S. SPRECHER, D D. A. C. WEDEKIND, D. D.

C. A. STORK, D. D. J. H. W. STUCKENBURG, D. D.

NEW SERIES—VOL. IX.

STATE LIBRARY
HARRISBURG,
PENNSYLVANIA

GETTYSBURG:
J. E. WIBLE PRINTER, COR. OF WASHINGTON AND NORTH STREETS.
1879.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/vol9lutheranquar00luth

Article. Page.

I. Eternal Punishment,..... 1
By Rev. L. G. M. Miller, Salem, Va.

II. The Relations of the Public Schools to the Colleges,..... 28
By Rev. Prof. J. R. Dimm, A. M., of Lutherville Female Seminary.

III. Human Conditions of a Good Prayer Meeting,..... 47
By L. A. Gotwald, D. D., York, Pa.

IV. The Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper,..... 67
Translated from the German of Rev. Dr. v. Burger of Munich, by Rev. G. F. Behringer, Mendon, Ill.

V. Thought the Great Reality,..... 89
By Prof. W. H. Wynn, Ph. D., State Agricultural College, Ames, Ia.

VI. Acting from Principle,..... 113
By M. Valentine, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.

VII. The Historical Witness,..... 131
Rev. Charles S. Albert, A. M., Carlisle, Pa.

VIII. Literary Intelligence,..... 142
American.—Biblical and Theological—Philosophical and Scientific—Historical and Biographical—Poetry—Miscellaneous.
German.—Biblical—Historical—Systematic—Practical.

IX. Notices of New Publications,..... 145
The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version—Lange's Commentary—A Popular Commentary on the New Testament—Discussions in Church Polity—Gates into the Psalm-Country—Epochs of Modern History—The Ceramic Art—Illustrated History of Ancient Literature, Oriental and Classical—English Men of Letters: Samuel Johnson, Edward Gibbon, Sir Walter Scott, Shelly—Shakespeare's Comedy of Much Ado About Nothing—Stories from Virgil—The Story of the Christians and the Moors in Spain—The Æneid of Virgil—The Odyssey of Homer—Visions—Boston Monday Lectures—Outlines of Theology—Theological Lectures—History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin—Home Lessons on the Old Paths—Rock of Ages—Wordsworth—The Unity of the New Testament—Pizarro—Select Poems—Mother-Play, and Nursery Songs—Live Boys—Burying the Hatchet—Flaxie Frizzle Stories—The Atonement Viewed as Assumed Divine Responsibility—Recreation Songs—Sermons—Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures—Through Bible Lands—Life and Adventures in Japan—Guiding Lights—Life of John Eadie, D. D., LL. D.—Socialism—The French Revolutionary Epoch—Oratory and Orators—Getting on in the World.

81712

—o—

Article. Page.

I. Art in Its Relation to Worship in the Lutheran Church,..... 169
By Rev. W. Strobel, D. D., Rhinebeck, New York.

II. Evolution: Shall it be Atheistic?..... 179
By Rev. W. E. Parson, A. M., lately Professor in the Imperial University, Tokio, Japan.

III. Preachers' Sons,..... 200
By Rev. Prof. J. B. Focht, Selinsgrove, Pa.

IV. Origin and History of Premillenarianism,..... 207
By C. A. Briggs, D. D., Professor in Union Theological Sem., N. Y.

V. The Lutheran Church between the Potomac and the Rio Grande,..... 245
By Rev. W. E. Htbbert, Blacksburg, Va.

VI. Historical Sketch of Our India Mission,..... 262
By Rev. A. D. Rowe, A. M., Guntoor, India.

VII. The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper,..... 276
Translated from the German of the Rev. Prof. J. J. Herzog, D. D., of Erlangen, by the Rev. G. F. Behringer, Mendon, Ill.

VIII. Literary Intelligence, ... 295
American.—Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—Poetry—Miscellaneous.

IX. Notices of New Publications,..... 296
Second Free Lutheran Diet in America—My Duty to the Church of which I am a member—Ten Reasons why I should regularly attend the Public Worship of God—The Fireside Encyclopædia of Poetry—Voices from Babylon—The Englishman's Critical and Expository Bible Cyclopædia—Philosophy, Historical and Critical—Life and Times of Stein—Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religions of India—Bismarck in the Franco-German War 1870-1871—St. Paul at Athens—Epochs of Ancient History—The Dawn of History—Outlines of Ontological Science—The English Reformation—Studies in the Model Prayer—Spiritual Manifestations—At the Back of the Moon—"Saying the Catechism"—Heredity—The New Testament—Lectures on the History of Ancient Philosophy—Sermons—Lectures on Preaching—Elements of General and Christian Theology—Thirty-three Practical Sermons—A History of the Church of England—Bedouin Tribes of the Euphrates—English Men of Letters, Goldsmith, Hume—L. Annæus Seneca—M. Tullii Ciceronis De Natura Deorm De Divinatione De Fato Reconovit Reinholdus Klotz—American Authors—Joh. Guilielmi Baieri Compendium Theologiæ Positivæ—Cummunism and Socialism—Short History of German Literature—Young Folk's History of Germany—The Sentence and its Parts--The Hebrew New Testament--Comblutensische Varianten zum Alttestamentlichen Texte—*Του εν Αγιοις Πατρος Ημων Αθανασιου αρχιεπισκοπου Αλεξανδρειας Επιστολη.*

—o—

Article. Page.

I. Relation of Children to the Church,..... 325
By M. Valentine, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

II. The Messianic Idea in Pre-Christian Apocalyptic Literature,..... 346
By Rev. George H. Schodde, A. M., Ph. D., Martin's Ferry, Ohio.

III. The Chinese Problem, or Agnosticism Worked Out, 371
By C. A. Stork, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

IV. Regeneration by Baptism,..... 390
By Rev. Prof. E. F. Giese, Carthage College, Ill.

V. The Ritual of the Lord's Supper,..... 421
Translated from the German of the Rev. Dr. E. Stæhelin, of Basel, by Rev. G. F. Behringer, Mendon, Ill.

VI. Sketch of Muhlenberg Mission, Africa,,..... 449
By Rev. J. A. Clutz, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

VII. General Synod,..... 464

VIII. Literary Intelligence,..... 469
Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—Art—Miscellaneous.

IX. Notices of New Publications,..... 471

From Egypt to Palestine through Sinai, the Wilderness and South Country—Moses the Law-Giver—Edmund Spenser—Robert Burns—A History of Our Own Times—Eothen—The Grammar of Painting and Engraving—The Barque Future—Oh, Why Should the Spirit of Mortal be Proud?—Resurgit—Marriage—Conference Papers—Faith and Rationalism—Cæsar—Studies in Theism—The Encyclopædia Britannica—Life Pictures of Spener and His Times—Walks to Emmaus—Entertainments—Yensie Walton—Six Months at Mrs. Prior's—Poor Papa—Ministers' Hand-Book—The Pastor's Confirmation Gift—Joh. Guilielmi Baieri Compendium Theologiæ Positvæ.

—o—

Article. Page.

I. Church Orders: or the Necessity of a Right Call to the Office of the Ministry,..... 485
By L. A. Gotwald, D. D., York, Pa.

II. Home Mission and Church Extension Work Among Lutherans, especially in the Great Northwest, 593
By S. W. Harkey, D. D., Washington, Illinois.

III. Qualifications for the Gospel Ministry,..... 603
By Rev. P. Born, Selinsgrove, Pa.

IV. The Annihilation Theory Briefly Examined,..... 613
By Rev. D. M. Gilbert, A. M., Winchester, Va.

V. Aspiration and Perspiration,..... 648
By M. Valentine, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

VI. Notices of New Publications,..... 668

A Comprehensive and Complete Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament—The Groundwork of a System of Evangelical Lutheran Theology—Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature—History of the English People—Readings from English History—Annual Record of Science and Industry—Shakespeare's Tragedy of Othello, the Moor of Venice—English Men of Letters: Edmund Spenser, Robert Burns, Goldsmith, William M. Thackeray—How to Get Strong and How to Stay So—Beyond the Grave—Normal Outline Series: Outlines of Christian Ethics; A Short History of the English Bible—A Summer Jaunt through the Old World—The Life and Letters of Madame Bonaparte—Epitome of Rev. Dr. Erick Pontoppidan's Explanation of Martin Luther's Small Catechism—The Human Species.

INDEX TO VOL. IX.

Æneid of Virgil, Translation, noticed, 153.
Annihilation Theory Examined, 613.
Albert, Rev. C. S., Art. by, 131.
Art and Worship in Luth. Ch., 169.
Atonement, Dr. Samson, 162.
Aspiration and Perspiration, 648.

Babylon, Voices from, 892.
Behringer, Rev. G. F., Arts. by, 67, 277, 421.
Briggs, Dr. C. A., Art. by, 207.
Bismarck, 306.
Brooks', Phillips, Sermons, 163.
Butler's, Archer, Lectures and Sermons, 314—316.
Born, Rev. P., Art. by, 600.

Ceramic Art, 151.
Chinese Problem, 371.
Children, Relation to Church, 325.
Commentaries: Speaker's, Lange's, Popular, Critical, 145, 146, 147, 299.
Church Polity, Hodge's, 148.
Cook, Jos., Lectures, 155, 312, 475.
Clutz, Rev. J. A., Art. by, 469.
Conference Papers, Dr. Hodge's, 476.
Cæsar, Froude, 475.
Church Orders, 485.

Dimm, Prof. J. R., Art. by, 28.

English Men of Letters, 152, 319, 473.
Encyc. Britannica, 167, 479.
Eternal Punishment, 1.
Evolution, 119.
Egypt to Palestine, 471.

Faith and Rationalism, 476.
Fireside Encyc. of Poetry, 297.
Focht, Prof. J. B., Art. by, 200.
French Revolution, 166.
Foster, Bishop, Beyond the Grave, 674.

General Synod, 464.
Giese, Prof., Art. by, 390.
Gotwald, Dr. L. A., Arts. by, 47, 485.
Gilbert, Rev. D. M., Art. by, 613.
Green's English People, 672.

Harkey, Dr. S. W., Art. by, 593.
Harman's, Dr., Introduction, 164.
History of Church of England, 318.
Historical Witness, 131.
Hebrew Lexicon, Davies, 668.
Hubbert, Rev. W. E., Art. by, 245.
Home Missions in the West, 593.
Human Species, Quatrefages, 675.
India Mission, 262.

Lord's Supper, Lutheran view, 67.
Lord's Supper, Reformed view, 277
Lord's Supper, Ritual of, 421.

Luth. Church Between the Potomac and Rio Grande, 245.
Lutheran Diet, Second, 296.

Ministry, Qualification for, 603.
Messianic, Idea before Christ, 346.
Miller, Rev. L. G. M., Art. by, 1.
Muhlenberg Mission, 449.
Moses the Lawgiver, 472.
McClintock and Strong's Cyclop., 672.

New Testament, Unity of, 160.

Odyssey of Homer, Translation, 154.
Ontological Science, Day, 309.

Parson, Prof. W. E. Art. by, 179.
Prayer Meeting, good, 47.
Principle, Acting from, 113.
Public Schools and Colleges, 28.
Preachers' Sons, 201.
Premillenarianism, 207.
Philosophy, Historical and Critical, 301.
Paul at Athens, 307.

Reformation, English, 310.
Reformation, D'Aubigne's, 158.
Religion, Origin, etc., Müller, 303.
Regeneration by Baptism, 390.
Rowe, Rev. A. D., Art. by, 262.
Rock of Ages, 159.

Stein, Life and Times, 301.
Simpson's, Bishop, Yale Lectures, 317.
Strobel, Dr. W., Art. by, 169.
Syriac Version N. T., 313.
Schodde, Dr. G. H., Art. by, 346.
Stork, Dr. C. A., Art. by, 371.

Theism, Studies in, 478.
Theology, Hodge's Outlines, 157.
Theological Lectures, 158.
Thought the Great Reality, 89.
Theology, Dr. Sprecher's, 669.

Valentine, Dr. M., Arts. by, 113, 325, 648.

Wynn, Prof. W. H., Art. by, 89.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JANUARY, 1879.

ARTICLE I.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

By Rev. L. G. M. MILLER, Salem, Va.

As this doctrine has been most bitterly attacked, not only by those who glory in their rejection of the Bible, as a Revelation from God, but also by some of the foremost who claim to preach it as the word of God, it may be well to consider, in all candor, some of the objections which have been most strongly urged against it. And this we regard as the more proper, inasmuch as these objections, loudly proclaimed in the pulpit in our own land and beyond the sea, have been scattered broadcast among the people, and aroused in many a spirit of earnest inquiry. The sermons, which have principally occasioned the late and still continuing heated debate preached by Canon Farrar in London, and one preached by concerning the doctrine of eternal punishment, are a series, Mr. Beecher, headed "*The Background of Mystery.*" These sermons we take as representative, that is, summing up in themselves the fundamental positions which are at any time and at all times urged against the doctrine, so that in dealing with them, we deal with the grand principles which would

underlie any discussion of the general subject. We have had access to only three of Canon Farrar's sermons, viz., "*Eternal Punishment*," "*Is Life worth Living?*" "*Are there few that be saved?*"

Let us lay down some general principles, which should pervade all examination of Christian doctrine—the antecedent question, underlying and going before all others, is this, Is the Bible the word of God, as it claims to be? If it is not, then it has no authority whatever, and should be rejected in toto. If it is God's own word, then it, and it alone, has *all* authority. Its decisions are final. As God is supposed to know His own will better than man could know it, that revealed will itself is to decide in all questions which may arise concerning it, nor in deciding them is it ever allowable to put aside God's word, and ransack human reason and experience instead. Theologians may well learn, concerning the application of this principle, from men of science, though it seems that those who laud science most, are slowest to learn this very lesson. The scientific method bases itself, not on speculations and a priori reasonings, but on *observed facts*, it does not ransack the subjective world to arrive at conclusions concerning objective phenomena, but goes into the objective world of nature to learn. Moreover the scientist is told that he must come humbly to nature herself always, that he must lay aside all preconceived notions, and implicitly accept what nature reveals to observation, however much her teachings, thus rendered, may be opposed to all those notions. The final question never is, How *ought* nature to act under certain conditions? but only and always, How *does* she act under those conditions? The observation of nature herself is the only safe guide. But nature and the Bible are two complementary volumes of the same great book, written, both of them, by the finger of God. Nature reveals His hand, the Bible His heart, nature reveals His power, the Bible His grace, nature is His workmanship, the Bible His will. They mutually illumine each other, neither is complete without the other, and together they constitute the inseparable and mutually explanatory revelation of God

to man. They are the two differentials, whose integration is found in God alone, two convergent rays, centering in the same great luminary. This being the case, the same principles which underlie the study of the one, underlie also the study of the other. Humility, docility, freedom from bias, are prime requisites in the study of either, a willingness to submit every question in their sphere to their supreme arbitrament. Let theologians then bring the scientific method to bear in the study of the Bible, in the decision of all questions pertaining to the spiritual universe. Yet, as we said before, those who praise that method most in the study of nature, often violate it most in dealing with its twin volume, the Bible. The plunge into metaphysical speculations, they tell us what God *ought* to do, and consequently what He *will* do, and satisfied by their own reasonings in the matter, fail to recur to the only authoritative arbiter, the written word itself. This method of studying nature according to the Aristotelian plan, was the bane of science as long as pursued, and led to innumerable blunders. But now we know that it is utterly vicious to study nature thus—equally is it so in deciding spiritual questions. Now the scientist must come to the book of nature alone, *observe facts*, and unconditionally accept facts as they develop themselves in nature—exactly so must the sacred scientist proceed. Having accepted the Bible as God's revealed will, then careful, humble, docile observation of the written word is to decide all questions treated of in that word, not man's speculations. The man of science must not lay down a theory, however beautiful, and then try to force facts into conformity with it, whether they are willing or not—but he must observe his facts *first*, and then make his theory conform to them. So the theologian must not spin out his fine theory first, and lay down for God what He of necessity *ought* to do, and *must* do, if He would be loving and just, and then force scripture into agreement with his theory—but he must first consult *God's Statements*, and form his theory accordingly. Had theologians acted upon this plain and simple principle, it would have saved them from many sad blunders, and an observation of the same principle would

wonderfully diminish the present supposed (for it is only supposed) conflict between science and the Bible. Men read theories into nature, and they read theories into the Bible, and when these theories clash, they say that nature and the Bible clash. It is one thing, however, for man's *interpretation* of nature, and man's *interpretation* of the Bible to conflict, and quite another thing for nature itself and the Bible itself to conflict.

It is dangerous to generalize too rapidly—to build a theory upon an insufficient number of facts in nature—or to build a theory upon a few dark and fragmentary sayings of the word of God, to the exclusion of its plainer declarations. There are seeming contradictions in nature, as the *expansion* rather than *contraction* of freezing water, which are yet *facts*, though they sometimes seem to us to be utterly opposed to the general analogy of nature. So exactly is it in the spiritual world which God's word reveals. There are facts in that mysterious world which far transcend the analysis of the keenest human intellect, which *seem* contradictory to all our notions, and yet, like the expansion of freezing water, there they stand. What are we to do with them? The scientist would laugh at the idea of abolishing an observed fact of nature, whether we can explain it or not. So the true student of the Bible should laugh at the idea of abolishing a plain statement of God's word, a spiritual fact, whether he can reconcile and explain it or not. Nor should we, either in nature or the Bible, throw away naked facts, or plain, simple statements, to make way for that which is confessedly more uncertain, less plainly revealed. And again, one solitary, plain, evident *fact* in nature, would invalidate any theory whatsoever, which could not, in any possible way, be brought into agreement with it. So, any one plain, evident statement of God's word will invalidate any theory which is opposed to it.

These general principles we revert to, because they are constantly and flagrantly violated by all those who seek to overthrow the fact of eternal punishment, as it stands revealed in the word of God.

Let it be remembered that Beecher and Canon Farrar both profess to accept the Bible as the revealed word of God. They both admit that nature and the Bible emanate from the same source, hence we are not inconsistent in holding them to the same principles in the investigation of each of these great, complementary volumes. They must be as careful not to project the subjective into the objective in the one case as in the other. Imagination, speculation, must always be held in subordination to fact in the study of the one volume, and to explicit statement in the other.

Let us look then at Mr. Beecher's sermon. The first general circumstance which strikes us, is the very large proportion of space which is devoted to reasonings and speculations, and the almost entire absence of direct appeals to the written word. Again, we are struck with the strong antagonism running all through it—the beauty and scriptural correctness of the fundamental premise, the utter incongruity of the conclusion therewith. "*The Background of Mystery*," the title under which it is printed, is expressive of the fundamental premise laid down as the basis of the discourse. We, as finite beings, are encompassed on every hand by the infinite—as the Scriptures say, "In Him (the infinite One) we live, and move, and have our being." It follows then that, pursue what line of investigation we may, sooner or later we come to the end of our capacity, and still beyond us stretches the unfathomable infinite. As Mr. Beecher expresses it, "The background of all theology, as treating of the nature of God, and of the divine moral government, is mystery. The abyss which lies back of human knowledge is simply infinite—an abyss of mystery." Again, "That while we have elementary faculties and feelings which define for us the divine nature, those same feelings and faculties exist in God in such rarity, in such scope, in such combinations, and they act after methods that so transcend their action when limited to an organization of flesh, that there is always a vast background of mystery beyond them." Again,—"Human conditions; but God is free from such conditions; He stands above them and beyond them; and in Him those qualities (love,

mercy, gentleness, &c.) take on forms so large and intense, that, after all, the background of every one of our thoughts in respect to the nature of God and the divine moral government is simply untraceable by human imagination or thought;" and again: "In the sphere of the eternities religious truth is nebulous and mystical; it has a deep background of mystery." These quotations then express the fundamental premise running through the sermon, and beautifully set forth the utter incapacity of the finite, human intellect to decide for itself questions involving the infinite. Now what would have been the logical conclusion from such a premise? Would it not have been this that follows? Inasmuch as the abyss lying back of human knowledge is infinite, and, in the very nature of the case, far transcending all my powers—and inasmuch as He who filleth eternity, to whom there is no abyss of mystery, in whose sight *all things* are naked and open, has graciously revealed in His word, to some extent, what lies in that great unknown (to me) abyss—therefore I will yield unquestioning assent to what that word declares, though it may be dark and incomprehensible to me now. He is love—He is true—and what I know not now, I shall know hereafter. Such, it seems to us, would be the only reasonable conclusion to one who believes in the God of the Bible, and that the Bible is His revelation, all of which we understand Mr. Beecher to believe. But does he draw this conclusion? does he submit unconditionally to the decision of God's word as to what lies in the abyss which transcends human knowledge? Let him answer for himself: "If now you tell me that this great mass of men, because they had not the knowledge of God, went to heaven, I say that the inroad of such a vast amount of mud, swept into heaven, would be destructive of its purity, and I cannot accept that view. If, on the other hand, you say that they went to hell, then you make an infidel of me." Now what is involved in that statement? Why Mr. Beecher here assumes to decide on one of the profoundest problems of God's moral government, involving the infinite in its every element. He shuts the class of which he speaks out of heaven, he also shuts

them out of hell. Rather than accept the latter conclusion, whatever the Bible may say upon the subject, he would reject the Bible altogether, become an infidel. He is determined that there must be a third state beyond the grave, which is neither heaven nor hell, as the result of his own cogitations on the subject. Again, in the same connection, he says: "But I will not worship the devil, though he should come dressed in royal robes and sit on the throne of Jehovah. I *will not* worship cruelty. I *will* worship Love—that sacrifices itself for the good of those that err, and that is as patient with them as a mother is with a sick child. With every power of my being will I worship a God such as that." Or in other words, Mr. Beecher is stubbornly set in his demands as to what the God must be who claims any recognition from him. If Jehovah were to deal in a certain way with those classes of men, whether the Bible teaches it or not, He would be devilish, He would be cruel, and Mr. Beecher would set himself in determined opposition to Him. There is only one possible way for even God to act so as to merit his approval and allegiance in these matters, which involve at every turn infinite issues, far transcending the powers of the human mind properly to grapple with, and that is, to deal with them as a mother deals with a sick child. Only a God who thus conducts Himself according to his notions will he consent to adore. Again, "Take away the doctrine of the finality of things at death * * and the trouble ceases"—or in other words, some parts of the Bible seem to contain a troublesome doctrine which painfully fails to fit into the character of the beautiful ideal God, whom Mr. Beecher has excogitated, and all you have to do in order to preserve the ideal in all its beauty, will be to cut that doctrine out. The ideal must stand, for Mr. Beecher could not worship any other one, and if even Jehovah Himself should intimate that He might possibly act otherwise in the premises than Mr. Beecher prescribes He should do, it would only convince Mr. Beecher that He was the devil dressed up in Jehovah's garb.

Now again we ask, what do all such statements imply, to which might be added others from this same sermon of sim-

ilar import? They are final judgments, without appeal, shutting God down to a certain general course, and only one, in dealing with these classes of men in the future. And what do such judgments, in order that they may be just, involve? They involve an absolute, all-comprehending knowledge of *sin*, its causes, character and results. Has Mr. Beecher that knowledge? The Bible speaks of "the *mystery* of iniquity." God must deal with the sinner, as the mother with the sick child—any other course would show lack of love, cruelty. But is sin in the sinner altogether analogous to sickness in the child? There is no GUILT in the child toward the mother because it is sick. Is there then no *guilt* in the sinner toward God? Rom. 3 : 19 says, "That *all the world* may become *guilty* before God." If then the relation which the sinner, as a sinner, stands in toward God is entirely different from that which the sick child stands in toward its mother, why *must* God deal with the sinner just as the mother with the child? Again, these judgments imply in Mr. Beecher a knowledge of what infinite love and infinite justice demand in God in dealing with the infinite evil called sin, and of what would constitute cruelty therein. Has he that knowledge? Let him answer for himself. "So our conception of finite love *is not* to interpret *God's conception* of infinite love. Why, what is love? What do we know about it? * * With us at best it is restricted and imperfect. But what is the love of the infinite?" This is one answer, and now another. "But God is free from such conditions (human conditions); He stands above them and beyond them; and in Him those qualities (love, mercy, &c.) take on forms so large and intense that, after all, the background of *every one of our thoughts* in respect to the nature of God, and *the divine moral government* is simply *untraceable* by human imagination or thought." If then our conception of finite love is not to interpret God's conception of infinite love, if we do not know what the love of the infinite is, if the background of every one of our thoughts in respect to the nature of God and the divine moral government is simply untraceable by human imagination or thought, why then does Mr. Beecher

pass judgments implying absolute knowledge concerning all these things! If "in the sphere of the eternities religious truth is nebulous and mystical," why does he insist on stretching the line of human reason over into the eternities, and say that there, as here, there must be probation and not finality? that God must move back the limits of His long-suffering and forbearance into the eternities? Here then we see the antagonism referred to—in his premise he admits human limitation, ignorance, utter incapacity to deal with the infinite, yet at the same time draws conclusions, which, to be just, presuppose the absence of all human limitation, ignorance, &c.

The fact is, God's disposition of sinners in the future involves the whole question of "the mystery of iniquity," from beginning to end, and this in turn involves omniscience. Sin stands related to the eternity past and the eternity to come. Its ramifications stretch into the infinite in every direction. This world of ours, and that which can be contained in the utmost stretch of human thought, is but one little link in the great chain of cause and effect which reaches from the everlasting to the everlasting. Every line of sequences which passes through the point on which we stand comes out of the infinite, and goes into the infinite beyond. Look which way we will, there is an inexorable horizon which bounds our mental sight, and beyond that horizon lies still the infinite. Our globe is a transition point for infinites. If this be true, then no created intelligence has, or can have, the data requisite in order to pass sentence upon sin, involving, as it does, the entire moral government of God. The absolute, the omniscient only can have that. The child who had only known his father in the endearing surroundings of home, and heard his voice in the tender accents of love, would not understand it, were he to see him in all the dread horror of the battle-field, his sword dripping with human gore, his aspect terrible—yet the very love which showed itself so tenderly at home might be the motive that sent that father to the field, and nerved his arm for every stroke it struck. The child

might not understand how love could have such contrary manifestations, nor could the father explain it to its infant mind, yet the two are easily reconcilable when knowledge has grown sufficiently. Consequently, "let us judge nothing before the time," but let us rather say, "I was dumb, I opened not my mouth, because *thou* didst it." All depends upon the *character* of God as wisdom, truth and love, and that character can only be known by faith. That the Infinite One is perfect, is the axiom which underlies all conceivable knowledge whatsoever. We should not presume to say what God must do in order to be just and loving, but humbly judge that to be just and loving which God does, and because He does it. The proper inference from the background of mystery is, that as finite beings, surrounded by mystery on every hand, we must humbly consult the light which the Infinite One has been pleased to give us, and unhesitatingly accept His statements, relying upon His perfect wisdom, truth and love, though we may not yet understand how those statements are to be reconciled with that wisdom, truth and love. This Mr. Beecher has not done, but insists on God's allowing certain opportunities to certain classes of men in the world to come, on pain of his becoming an infidel. How he brings this stubborn assertion of his right of final judgment in the matter, into harmony with his previous admission of human incapacity to grasp much that is necessarily involved in any intelligent decision of it, we do not see. We fear he does not view the terrible *guilt* and sinfulness of sin as God views it, or he would more humbly receive what God says about its infinite consequences.

Now let us look at some of Canon Farrar's statements. We discover in them intense aversion to the fact of eternal punishment, and the stubborn determination not to admit it, the assumption of ability to say what God ought to and must do, a resolute effort to force scripture into agreement with this foregone conclusion, prominence given to reasonings and speculations, the covert error that we are to bring all the facts of the word of God to the supreme test of human understanding, and although God so far transcends our

utmost conceptions, that still He must submit to be measured, and even controlled, in all the infinite problems which present themselves in His moral government, by the feeble standard of human sensibilities and impulses. He does not, as Mr. Beecher, elaborate a premise first, whose legitimate application altogether undermines the conclusions which he draws—but the same ultra rationalizing tendency appears in both, the fixed purpose to stake out for God the limits which are necessarily to bound Him in the exercise of His infinite justice, love, &c.

We do not see how Canon Farrar can justly inveigh against "those who pretend to dignify with the name of scriptural argument the ever widening spirals of dim and attenuated inference out of the narrow aperture of single texts," when he himself builds up an argument against eternal punishment on the text in 1 Pet. 4 : 6, which is confessedly one of the darkest and most mysterious statements in the Gospel, the interpretation of which is by no means agreed on, and which stands almost alone, without any large amount of light thrown on it by other scripture, whilst many clear and explicit declarations of God's word utterly preclude the application which he gives to it. He says on this point—"St. Peter tells you in so many words, in the passage which I have chosen for my text (1 Pet. 4 : 6), that the Gospel was preached to those that are dead ; and if, as the Church in every age has held, the fate of those dead sinners was not irrevocably fixed by death, then it must be clear and obvious to the very meanest understanding that neither of necessity is ours." Let us see whether this is so plain that "it must be clear and obvious to the very meanest understanding?" St. Peter tells us that the Gospel "*was* preached"—it was in the past, to those who had, in the distant past, and under peculiar circumstances of disadvantage, been swept away from earth. He does not say that it *shall be* preached again to the dead in any circumstances, nor does any other passage of the word of God say so. Canon Farrar says that since *their* fate was not irrevocably fixed at death, *therefore ours* is not of necessity so. And then, leaping to the conclusion that it *is not* fixed, he

goes on to say to his hearers—"There is hope *for you*—hope for you, *even if death overtake* you before the final victory is won * * though *you too*, if you should *continue in sin*, may have to be purified in that gehenna of *αἰώνιος* fire beyond the grave." How does he know, that since *their* fate was not fixed, *therefore ours* is not? Were *their* privileges as great as *ours?* Is there no difference between the case of one who lives in the full blaze of gospel light, and one who lived in the darkness of that antediluvian day? No difference between those, and them who sat in front of Canon Farrar, who have listened again and again to the offers of redemption through a crucified and risen Saviour, and who again and again, turning a deaf ear to the warnings of God, have trampled under foot the blood of His dear Son? And if in every way, *their* case, of whom the text speaks, is so different in privilege and opportunity from *ours*, how does he dare to say that *their* judgment and *ours* must be the same, and on the authority of God speak hope to those to whom God has not spoken hope? Has he never read, "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required?" What right has he then to assume and declare that because the Gospel *was* preached *to them*, therefore it *will be* to those who die impenitent in the midst of gospel light? Surely this is "dim and attenuated inference out of the narrow aperture of single texts." The Scripture says, "He that, being *often reproved*, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that *without remedy.*" How then can Canon Farrar say to those who have been often reproved, and often hardened their necks, that their destruction *shall not* be "without remedy?" And again God says, "Because I *have called*, and ye *refused;* but ye have *set at naught* all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at *your calamity;* I will mock when *your fear* cometh; for that they *hated* knowledge, and *did not choose* the fear of the Lord—they *despised* all my reproof—*therefore* shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices." Canon Farrar would have done better to utter this solemn warning in the ears of that great congregation, many of whom were doubtless hard-

ened rejectors of the Lord Jesus, than to feed them on inference not legitimately based on God's word.

We are surprised that one "claiming the fullest right to speak with the authority of knowledge," should evince the ignorance which seems to be evinced by the following—"Now I ask you, my brethren, very solemnly, where would be the popular teachings about hell, if we calmly and deliberately erased from our English Bible the three words "damnation," "hell," and "everlasting?" We presume he means by "the popular teachings about hell" the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent. Now he ought certainly to know that some of the most powerful and irrefutable passages of God's word, which teach this doctrine, contain not one of those three words—so that if every passage containing them were stricken out of the Bible, the doctrine would still stand on a stable foundation. Some of the passages, containing none of the above words, yet clearly containing "the popular teachings about hell," we adduce here. In Mat. 3 : 12 we have this statement: "But He will burn up (consume utterly) the chaff with *unquenchable* fire." Mat. 12 : 32: "Shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Now there can be no entrance into heaven without forgiveness, consequently, as we have here an explicit statement that this sin has never forgiveness, it unavoidably follows that there is a state of eternal banishment from God. In Luke 16 : 26, Abraham says to the rich man, both of them no longer on earth, but in the world to come, "between us and you there is a great gulf *fixed* (set fast); so that they which would pass from hence to you *cannot:* neither *can* they pass to us, that would come from thence." If that gulf were ever to be closed, it would not be *fixed, set fast.* The parties in this conversation were in the world to come, and hence were using, not the language of this world, but of that one. When Jesus spoke this parable, He knew full well all the inferences flowing therefrom, nor would He, when He introduces us into the future world, and allows us to hear the conversation of parties there, give us an utterly false and misleading view of circumstances

there. In John 3 : 36, we have this declaration, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God *abideth* on him." Now what is the meaning of *abideth?*" It means to remain, to stand firm, to continue. If that wrath then were ever to be removed, however far in the future, it would not be "abiding." We must remember that this is *God's word*, spoken from *God's standpoint.* Again, the parable in Luke 14 : 15—24 is most solemnly instructive on this point. And mark you, Jesus was speaking expressly of the kingdom of God, of the invitation given by God here, of the excuses which men make for not accepting that invitation here and now. The servant reports the manner in which they slighted the invitation, and the sentence of the lord of the feast is, "That *none* of those men which were bidden *shall taste* of my supper." Now would that be a true statement of the case, if those men were again in the distant future (and it would not alter the case, however far in the future it might be) to be invited again, and really be admitted to blessed participation in that supper? Then they *would taste* of his supper, and our Lord's representation would be untrue. In Eph. 5 : 5, it is written, "For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath *any inheritance* in the kingdom of Christ and of God." The point of the passage is, that those who wilfully persevere in these vices have no portion or reversion in God's kingdom, whatever. Now if they were to have a place among the saints, even after ages of suffering hereafter, they would have an inheritance then, which would simply be held in reversion, until they were prepared for it, and it would not be true at all that no such have "*any inheritance.*" 1 John 5 : 16 states, "He shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. *There is* a sin unto death; I do not say that he shall pray for it." Here there is a sin which excludes the hope, or even the prayer for life. Life is not to be given to those who commit that sin.

These are only a few of the passages, containing not one of the three words on which the doctrine of eternal punishment is said by Canon Farrar to hang, and which teach it quite as

strongly notwithstanding. Other passages which we shall hereafter cite, are quite as applicable here.

Notice the following statements made by Canon Farrar: "They (among whom he counts himself) will declare their trust that, even *after death*, through the infinite mercy of the loving Father, the dead shall be alive again, and multitudes, at any rate, of the lost be found." And remember, he is not like Beecher, speaking mainly of those who die and have died without the knowledge of God, but of those who die in the midst of gospel light, including those who sat before him when delivering these discourses. His statements in the most general and absolute way attack the doctrine of eternal punishment, with reference as well to those who hear and reject the Gospel, as to those who do not. Again, "—not of final and hopeless, but of that *purifying* and *corrective* punishment, which, as we all believe, does await impenitent sin, both here and *beyond the grave.*" Again, "—though you too ("you" refers to those who were sitting before him), if you *continue in sin*, may have to be *purified* in that gehenna of *αἰώνιος* fire *beyond* the grave." Now, we ask, upon what does he base the trust he so confidently declares? Where does he get the authority for preaching that the punishment which awaits the impenitent, those who continue and die in sin, and that too in the midst of gospel light, is *purifying and corrective*, not *final?* We know of no power able to cleanse from sin, save the blood of Jesus—"the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin"—but it seems that Canon Farrar has discovered that hell fire has that virtue also. Again: "He will indeed condemn us * * if we *die in wilful* sin, to His *αἰώνιος* fire: but *it is* (positive assertion) the *fire of love.* It is to purify, not to torture: it is *to melt, not to burn.*" In connection with the foregoing, notice the following—"I *cannot* preach the *certainty* of what is called universalism—that is, the view that *all* will finally be saved." "And if you ask me whether I must not believe in endless torments for these reprobates of earth, I answer, 'Ay, for them, and for thee, and for me too, *until* we have learned with all our hearts to love good, and not evil; but whether

God, for Christ's sake, may not enable us to do this, even beyond the grave, if we have failed to do so this side the grave, *I cannot say.*" But above he does say *positively*, even to those living and who would die "in wilful sin," to those who long had trampled under foot the blood of Jesus, and would continue to do so to the end, that the future punishment which they should endure, would be purifying and corrective; that the fire which they should feel, would be "to melt, not to burn." If he "cannot preach the certainty of universalism," why *does* he preach the certainty of it, and through that very universalism lull into carnal security those who are not only out of Christ, but who wilfully remain so? Again: "Think noble things of God. Be *sure* that * * Christ's infinite atonement *must*, in *some way*, though we *know not how*, mean—or at any rate, *we may suppose* it to mean * * that earth's sinners, far off, it may be, shall be transformed, far off, yet at last, into God's saints." This is one of the most remarkable statements which we ever read. It seems to have come from a mind in painful doubt and fear concerning the sweeping statements which it was giving utterance to. Are we to think those things "noble" which God tells us about Himself in His word—are we to submit our judgment to His revealed will—or are we to insist on erecting a standard of "nobility" for Him of our own, and attribute to Him such "noble things" as seem to darkened human reason most in keeping with His character, but which He positively denies of Himself in His word? We are to "be sure" that Christ's atonement "*must* in some way," though we cannot know how, mean a certain thing, then "we *may suppose* it to mean" it. Well now, if a thing is so certainly so that it *must* be so, and that we can "be sure" of it, what is the sense in saying after that, that we "may suppose" it to be? To talk about being permitted "to suppose" a thing to exist, whilst at the same time we are "sure" that it does and "must" exist, is absurd. That is surely an uncertain sort of certainty. Canon Farrar says that God's character absolutely demands that He should do a certain thing; He "must" do it, His justice, His love, His mercy, compel it, any other course would be loathsome,

utterly abhorrent to every human sensibility and impulse, is contrary to Scripture and everthing else, &c., and yet he "cannot say" whether, after all, God will do that thing or not: we "may suppose" it to be, and that is all. The difficulty is, that he sets up a standard of truth and justice and love for himself, and then tries to make God conform to that; he predetermines what the result "must" be, and then "flings from him with abhorrence" any other possible result. He will even twist and wrest all that God's word may say about it, and compel it to his conclusion, however unwilling it may be—and after all he lands square down upon the terra firma of "we may suppose," "I cannot say," and "I cannot preach the certainty." Ah! Canon Farrar accepts the Bible as the word of God, and then erects his own reason and sensibilities as the supreme tribunal before which its statements are to be tried. If the Bible is the word of God, but still must be supremely judged by Canon Farrar, what then? Then he must be higher authority than God Himself, and neither less nor more than this high prerogative does he assume, when he holds out to "wilful" sinners, continuing and dying in their sins, the delusive hope of a chance beyond the grave. He proclaims "Christ's universal and absolute redemption," "arraigns" anything "as mercilessly ignorant" and "impeaches" it "as a falsehood", which intimates the possibility that Christ's redemption may not be, as regards individuals, "universal and absolute" on account of their own wilful rejection, and yet he "cannot preach himself the certainty of what is called universalism—that is, the view that all will finally be saved." If to preach anything else is "mercilessly ignorant" and "a falsehood," yet if Canon Farrar cannot yet see his way clear "to preach the certainty of it," had he not better stop preaching till he can, lest he too should be "mercilessly ignorant," and convicted of "a falsehood?" Sad indeed it is when a man is reduced to preaching uncertainties, yet according to Canon Farrar's own mouth, the only way for him to avoid being "mercilessly ignorant" is to preach that of which he says "I cannot preach the certainty." But worse than

this, he at one time admits the uncertainty of final salvation to all, yet at another time with profound earnestness tells us that the fire of hell is "the fire of love"—that "it is to purify, not to torture—to melt, not to burn," and that even to those who "die in wilful sin." Now we ask, in the name of all that is of infinite import to sinful man, what can be gotten out of such a view of future punishment, but the most ultra and all-comprehensive doctrine of final salvation to all? If this is the character of the fire to which "wilful sinners" are to be subjected, then final salvation to all is the most absolute of certainties, yet the very man who so solemnly proclaims that this is the character of that fire, says that "I cannot preach the certainty of the view that all will finally be saved." "If St. Paul again and again flings from him the conclusions of an apparently irresistible logic," surely Canon Farrar claims greater freedom even than Paul, since he scornfully rejects the conclusions of a logic more than *apparently* irresistible.

We charge Canon Farrar with ultra rationalism. Let him speak for himself. He classes himself among "those who believe that *reason*, and *conscience*, and *experience*, *no less* than *Scripture*, are also books of God, and that they too must have a *direct voice* in these great decisions," that is, in those decisions which relate to the ultimate destinies of man. We maintain that reason is by no means in fallen man "a book of God" in the same sense as Scripture is. Reason is in no condition to have "a direct voice" in such decisions, since it cannot have the data upon which such decisions ought to be based, only the all-knowing God can have that. With Canon Farrar reason has an authority not only "no less than scripture," but far greater, since reason assumes to judge and set aside scripture. Again: "Finds no warrant, either in the general tone of scripture, or in God's *no less sacred* teachings through our *individual souls.*" Here again he expressly claims an independent and co-ordinate authority for human reason, the very claim which has led into the wildest excesses, and which is an entire setting aside of the supreme authority of God's word. Again: "I would rather accept, as reflecting

the *mind of God*, the *broad humanitarian charity*, the keen and tender *sensibilities*, than the hard systems of heartless theologians." Notice that the "heartless theologians" are those who uncompromisingly adhere to God's plain word, however much its statements may seemingly conflict with our feelings—and the "hard systems" are those which admit the doctrine of eternal punishment. Now if a man would "rather accept broad, humanitarian charity," and "the keen and tender sensibilities" as his guide to ultimate decision upon the mysterious questions arising out of human life, than the clear and explicit word of God, we do not wonder at any conclusions whatever at which he may arrive—but we do protest that no such person should any longer claim God's word as "the supreme rule of faith," but should boldly repudiate anything claiming to be a revelation from God, and exalt in its place the surer light of "humanitarian charity," and "the tender sensibilities." If these are a sufficient guide to the solution of the profoundest problems which can present themselves to the human mind, involving infinite issues, then a revelation from God is altogether superfluous.

These are only a few of the statements in these sermons, involving the most ultra rationalism, and the spirit which these extracts breathe pervades them throughout. They are a labored effort to bring God's word concerning the future of man to the supreme bar of "the tender sensibilities," and "with abhorrence" the author "flings" from him anything which does not approve itself to that supreme tribunal.

But we wish to review some of the foregoing statements from another point of view—we mean the statements that future punishment is altogether "purifying and corrective"—"remedial" in its nature and not final. Does God's word teach us that such is its character? Let us see—Prov. 29 : 1, "He that being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that *without remedy.*" It would be right hard to put a "remedial" construction upon that passage. God says that the destruction of the wilful and obdurate sinner is "without remedy"—Canon Farrar says it isn't—there then is a question of veracity between them. In the

conversation between Abraham and the rich man, before referred to, if the sufferings of the rich man were remedial and corrective, designed to fit him ultimately for the companionship of Abraham and the blessed in heaven, surely it would have been the most natural thing imaginable for Abraham to have encouraged him by telling him so—and had such been the fact, it would have been cruel indeed in Abraham not thus to cheer him. But instead of saying "Be of good cheer, Son, your dross only is being consumed by those flames, you are being made better, and after while that gulf will be bridged, and you will come over here among us," he says not one word of deliverance, but reminds him instead of the "great gulf *fixed*," over which there is, and can be, no passage. Instead of telling him that his brothers would have another chance beyond the grave, if they on earth rejected the truth, as he had done, he tells him that, if they hardened themselves against the agencies there employed, "Moses and the prophets," supernatural agencies would also fail with them. In Matt., 13, Jesus says "gather * * * the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat in my barn," and in explanation, He says, "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of Man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire." Here Jesus makes the burning of the tares represent the burning of the wicked at the end of time. But was the burning of the tares *remedial?* Were the tares *burnt into wheat*, and finally gathered into the barn? If our Lord intended here to employ a true analogy, and if sinners are to be transformed into saints in passing through the fires of hell, then Jesus ought to have said that the bundles of tares were thrown into the fire, not "to burn them," but in order that they might come out of the fire sheaves of wheat, and as such finally to be gathered into the barn along with the rest of the wheat. Jesus explicitly says that the fire is "to burn" them, Canon Farrar says, "the fire * * * is to melt, not to burn"—which is

right? Again, the wicked are represesented by chaff, which is to be burnt with "unquenchable fire." The same reasoning holds with reference to this figure. It would be an utter absurdity to talk of producing wheat out of chaff by burning it. The fire into which chaff is thrown is in no sense remedial, that is, intended to make wheat out of it. But if the fire into which the wicked are cast is remedial, purifying, corrective, then Jesus could not possibly have chosen a figure more inexpressive of His meaning, more incongruous, more misleading, than that of burning chaff. In John, 15, in the parable of the vine and the branches, Jesus says, "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered, and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." Are they burnt in order to restore them to their vital relationship to the vine? Far from it. But Jesus makes that burning analogous to the burning of those who reject Him. Where then does the remedial feature come in? One other case—in Mark, 14: 21, our Lord, in speaking of His betrayal by Judas, says of him, "Good were it for that man if he had never been born." But would this have been a true statement, if Judas, even after countless ages of punishment, was finally to be numbered among the saved? If his punishment were *ever* to terminate, however far in the future, its duration would still be *finite*, whilst the glory and blessedness upon which he would then enter would be in*finite* in duration. Now mathematics teaches us that any finite quantity whatever, compared with an infinite one, reduces to zero, or nothing. Consequently the finite duration of Judas's punishment, compared with the infinite duration of the blessedness to follow would be as zero to infinity, $(0 : \infty)$. How then could Jesus say, that a zero of suffering would overbalance an infinitude of happiness? Yet this is just what He would be saying, if Judas were ever to be delivered and inherit glory. We would call a man foolish indeed, who would not be willing to purchase a long life on earth of comfort and happiness by a second of agony, or a man who would not suffer an instantaneous pang, however sharp, to secure a long and prosperous reign in royal splendor.

But how much more would this be true of the Lord Jesus, if He would allow the instantaneous pang of hell fire (and it would be instantaneous, even though it were innumerable cycles of ages, compared with absolutely *endless* duration of happiness thereafter) to outweigh, in His estimation, the eternal glory which would follow? Any supposition then which would reduce our Lord's solemn declaration concerning Judas to utter absurdity and puerility (and it would be so reduced on the supposition that Judas is ever to be delivered), must be rejected.

And where does Canon Farrar get his authority for declaring, in refutation of the doctrine of eternal punishment, that Christ's redemption is "universal and absolute?" In its power, capacity, availability for the human race, it is so. But its appropriation by the individuals of the race is not universal and absolute. "All things are ready" indeed, but alas! all *persons* are not ready. The table is set, the food is prepared, sufficient, far more than sufficient for every son and daughter of Adam, but every one will not sit down and eat. The Scripture every where asserts that the *appropriation* of salvation is *conditional*, but just in this Canon Farrar asserts it to be "universal and absolute." Absolute means without condition, but the word of God uniformly conditions my enjoyment of Christ's redemption on faith: "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth* might not perish." Nowhere are we told that men should be saved irrespective of their attitude to Christ in this life.

But whilst we claim that the fact of eternal punishment can be established in the word of God, as we have endeavored to show, without the aid of those passages in which the words "damnation," "hell," or "everlasting" occur, we by no means admit that they are not used in Scripture "in our present acceptation of them," nor that they are in our present sense "mistranslations," as Canon Farrar affirms, nor do we intend to leave them out in deciding the question in point. We do not admit that we "foist into the word *αἰώνιος* the *fiction* of endless time," but we boldly claim that it legiti-

mately has that meaning, as its connections and uses clearly show. We do not deny that the word is used also of duration not eternal, but we do deny that this limited sense can be given to it in many of the passages in point, and affirm that the context often absolutely forbids the limited sense. To claim that the word *αἰώνιος always* means limited time because it sometimes is unquestionably so used, is unpardonable ignorance, or wilful perversion, we do not know which: for that is really Canon Farrar's position. We all know that the meaning of words often greatly changes by time and usage. Of this we have many striking examples in our own tongue. So it is well known that many classic Greek words had new ideas thrown into them by the New Testament writers, and necessarily so. Hence it happens that we would often make great mistakes, if we, in our interpretation of New Testament Greek, were to bind it to its strictly etymological sense, or its classic usage. Surely one claiming "the fullest right to speak with the authority of knowledge" should know this very simple fact. Our English word *forever* means, according to our usage of it, *endless* duration. Yet if we were to consult its etymology simply, coming as it does through the Latin *aevum* from that very word *ἀιών*, we might claim that it did not mean that at all, but meant simply age—long. And in the distant future, should our English ever become a dead language, the curious student of that day, digging down to the etymological root of the word, might claim, on the very same ground on which Canon Farrar proceeds in his determination of the meaning of *αἰώνιος*, that the word had *only* that meaning. But if he would be guided by the usage of the word in English, at the time of the writer's using it, he would find that our word *forever* did mean endless duration, whatever its etymology. So then, proceeding on this rational and well-recognized principle in the study of all language, we must examine the usage of the word *ἀιών* by the New Testament writers themselves, to ascertain its meaning in *their* writings. We suppose that all will admit, that if they ever wished to express the idea of absolutely endless duration, they would do so in speaking of

the duration of God Himself, and His unchanging attributes. What word then do they use in speaking of God's eternity? John 12 : 34: "Christ abideth forever (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*)." Rom. 1 : 25: "Creator, who is blessed forever (*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*)." Rom. 9 : 5: "God blessed forever (*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*)." 2 Cor. 9 : 9: "His righteousness remaineth forever (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*)." Heb. 13 : 8: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever (*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*)." 1 Pet. 1 : 23: "Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*)." These are only a few passages in which God's eternal existence and perfections are described by this idiom. Surely, the proper meaning of the word is indisputable here. But in 2 Pet. 2 : 17 the same expression is used of the duration of the punishment of the wicked, also in Jude 13. In Gal. 1 : 5, Phil. 4 : 20, 1 Tim. 1 : 17, and 2 Tim. 4 : 18, God's glory is said to endure forever and ever (*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*). In Rev. 4 : 9, 10; 5 : 14; 10 : 6; 15 : 7, and other places, the very same expression is used to denote the eternal existence and perfections of God. But in Rev. 20 : 10 the duration of the torment of the devil in the lake of fire is expressed by that identical idiom (*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*), and in the 15th verse of the same chapter, and in Rev. 21 : 8 we are told that the wicked have their part in the same lake of fire, the same second death. Now by what rule of interpretation can we say that this identical way of expressing duration means absolute eternity in the one case, and not in the other? The words and their arrangement are the same, and there is no hint that they are not intended to mean the same in both cases. Every law and usage of language and of common sense would be against any such arbitrary discrimination. So in Heb. 9 : 14; 1 Pet. 5 : 10; 1 John 1 : 2; the adjective *αἰώνιος* is used to describe the eternity of God's existence and glory, and in too many passages to attempt to cite them, it is used to describe the duration of the life and blessedness of the saved. But this very word is used also to describe the duration of the punishment of the wicked, and in Mat. 25 : 46, the Lord Jesus Himself, in the same breath, uses it to describe both the duration of the life

of the redeemed, and the punishment of the lost. In Matt. 25 : 41, our Lord states that the wicked are to go into *αἰώνιος* fire "prepared for the devil and his angels," and as we have seen in Rev. 20 : 10, the duration of that torment is described by the very same adjective expression which is used again and again to express the duration of God Himself. Surely then if we allow the New Testament writers themselves to explain by their own usage what they meant by a word, our word "everlasting" must stand in the word of God, after any and all versions whatever, and that too in its common acceptation, as expressing endless duration. If we want to shorten the duration of the punishment of the lost, then in accordance with every rule of consistency, we must also shorten the happiness of the saved, and the very existence of God Himself. If Canon Farrar is right, then the Lord Jesus and the Holy Ghost as well are open to the charge of inexplicable obscurity and confusion in the use of words. If he is right, that *αἰώνιος* can only be made to express endless duration by "foisting a fiction" into it, why then does God so persistently use it in describing His own existence? And why does Jesus use the same word in the same breath to express the duration of the life of the redeemed, and also that of the punishment of the lost, without one word of explanation? If Canon Farrar be right, then the Bible could not have been written as a plain and simple guide to the wayfaring man, but rather to perplex and mystify by its strange laxness in the use of words. But no, this is not the case. The Bible is plain, but because Canon Farrar "cannot and will not believe" its plain and simple statements, because his own "tender sensibilities and reason" have already prejudged what God must and ought to do, he wrests and distorts it as he would no other writing, and reads into some words, and out of others, a meaning which would reduce the whole thing to absurdity.

The fact is, that a candid review of both Beecher and Farrar's utterances upon this subject, (though in justice to Beecher, we say again, that in the sermon of his under con-

sideration, he by no means takes the ultra and absolute stand against the fact of eternal punishment in toto which Farrar does, but confines himself mainly to the question concerning the heathen), leads to the conclusion that their whole view of the case too much ignores the true guilt and character of sin, as well as too much exalts man's powers to deal, without the guidance of God's word, with infinite issues, implying infinite capacity of mind. Sin kills God. This is its outcome, its aim, its unalterable tendency, as we see upon the cross, when "God, the mighty Maker, died." Sin is the universal murderer. It seeks to slay the fountain and source of all life, and if the fountain could be destroyed, where would the streams then be? Remember well, only on the cross can the ultimate aim of sin be seen. Sin caused the death of God manifest in the flesh, and no thanks to sin that He rose again. Conceive every sun around which a system revolves in all this universe to be stricken out of existence in an instant, what would be the result? Blackness of darkness, no ray of pure and healing light to relieve the awful gloom—the lost and lawless worlds rushing madly through the darkness, crashing and shattering upon each other into a thousand fragments, and these fragments plunging wildly on and shattering on other fragments, a hell of terrific, seething, roaring sound, lit up occasionally by the lurid glare of the dissolving elements, till all creation returned, out of this dreadful chaos, into the nothingness from which, by the fiat of God, it came, and eternal night would fill eternal inanity—faint picture this of what would be in the spiritual as well as material universe, could sin accomplish that which it sought to do on Calvary, to strike out of being the Sun of Righteousness, around whom all things revolve, and in whom they live and move and have their being. And if this be the terrible nature of Sin, who but God can know what Sin deserves? How fearful the mistake to make too light of it! Sin hardens—"lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin." Might it not then grow harder and harder, until its obduracy becomes utterly hopeless? Man himself is a mystery, his constitu-

tion mysterious, he is in every sense "fearfully and wonderfully made." God only knows absolutely man's being and nature, God only knows sin ultimately, God only knows the modifications in man's nature which sin brings about, and God only knows how man thus modified, and who continues so, ought to and must be dealt with. If God sends man to hell, it is only because God sees that is the most merciful thing which He could in the nature of the case, in all its infinite bearings, do with him. They would have us believe that all hearts will finally be moved and melted by the love of God. The tender love of Jesus to poor, fallen man, did not move and melt the hearts of all with whom he came into contact here. The proud, hard heart of Scribe and Pharisee grew all the harder when the light and warmth of His presence fell upon them—no melting there. Hereafter they go on sinning, and go on hardening, as we see in that very passage in Luke 13, in which Canon Farrar takes one of his texts. The Lord there says: "Depart from me, all ye *workers* of iniquity." They were *still* working iniquity, though earth was now passed with them, for this the Lord's address implies. Shut out from God, and still obdurately working evil, what hope can there be for them? Let us not question God, let us not "limit" Him, as did His people of old—"Yea, they turned back and tempted God, and *limited* the Holy One of Israel"—let us not attempt for ourselves to solve the vast problem which God's moral government involves, every factor in which has a "deep background of mystery." But let us accept *His* solution of it as given in His word, without being able now to see all the whys and wherefores, for "shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?

ARTICLE II.

THE RELATIONS OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS TO THE COLLEGES.*

By Rev. Prof. J. R. Dimm, A. M., of Lutherville Female Seminary.

This subject is of wide range, and rather requires judgment in selection than fertility of imagination. It comprehends principles which embrace the most important interests of the Church and the government. It involves all the great processes now at work for the intellectual development and moral elevation of our nation and race. By its proper understanding these processes may be guided to a successful issue. By its misunderstanding or neglect, they may fail of their object and our nation come short of the high political, social, and intellectual destiny which we have hoped was marked out for it by the Deity. Let us then, as leaders of thought, sit down before the questions involved and attempt their solution, with a due sense of their importance and our responsibility.

The relations of the *Public Schools* to the Colleges are of two classes—those *imagined* and *assumed*, and those which are *true, real and vital.* Our first duty may be to define what is comprehended in the terms—Public or Common Schools. And we may premise here that they embrace much more now than when the institution came into existence. They include all grades of schools, from the primary and most elementary up to the "High School" and "City College." In the category must also be included the State Normal Schools, as they too, in part, are supported by State appropriations. In these schools, in the aggregate, are taken up all the branches of science, and all the languages that are taught in the most

*A Paper read before the Southern division of the Alumni of Pennsylvania College, at Hagerstown, Md., July 17, 1878. Published by request.

approved Colleges of the land. In the city schools we find drawing and music and, in some instances, painting. Thus the principle adopted, in the institution of public schools, is made to cover, in one place and another, all the possible branches of the most extended course of education. In the primary department are reading, writing, and arithmetic, with subordinate elementary branches. In the Grammar School may be learned geography, grammar, and the adjuncts to our own language. In the High School may be found the study of the classics to some extent, the higher mathematics; and in the City Colleges, the natural sciences, philosophy, German, French, and the ornamental branches.

Now we must admit that all this looks most admirable. Here is machinery enough to cover the ground and do the work of the most approved educational system. It looks as though our people should go right on educating and being educated up to intellectual, social, and religious exaltation. We justly take pride in all this structure. We rejoice in this vast system and costly machinery. It is doing a good and necessary work in the elevation of those whom it is reaching; and common schools are the hope for the intelligence of the masses of this country. Nor *up to a certain grade* would we disturb a timber in the building—remove a tile from its roof —a wheel from the machinery, or a cog from a wheel. No! let the public school system go on toward perfection, working in its proper sphere, and producing all the intellectual progress possible. There is work enough to be done for it and all the Colleges.

But this approval does not forbid our pointing out any *defects* we may see. It does not prevent us from showing where it *comes short of its objects*, and where it *transcends its province.*

It may be pertinent here to ask—What is the *object* of public instruction? What *end* should the state have in view in the education of the rising generations? Is it mere science? Is it profession? Is it religion? It cannot be any of these. It *must* be that in which all its subjects can equally participate. All cannot pursue science. Few can become professional. The state, as such, has no religion. The nearest ap-

proach to this can only be morality. All these then, and kindred objects, are out of the question. The state can have but one object in the education of youth—that is to *make good, intelligent, faithful citizens.*

All will agree that for this the state ought to make the most ample provision. But the system should be so extended and so organized as to offer its provisions to every incipient subject. And if there be any portion of the incipient citizens disposed to grow up into dangerous classes, the state is bound to itself, in self-defence, to make special provision to reach and educate them intellectually and morally.

To this purpose the elementary, up to *five* branches, are necessary. These are reading, writing, arithmetic, geography and grammar. Two of these—geography and grammar—have been thought by some to be superfluous; but we contend that a man cannot be a good, intelligent citizen without a knowledge of places, and ability to express himself well in the language of his own country. These branches are rightly called elementary. They are necessary to the full and free performance of all the functions of a citizen. They should be, as they are, enjoyed by both sexes. These five branches are all taught in the grades below and in the grammar school. These form a foundation upon which the citizen, with any talent, can build. He can rise to high intelligence and even political and social distinction. Up to the grammar school, the system of public instruction is excellent, so far as it reaches the masses, and is absolutely *necessary.* But here, in the estimation of many good and intelligent men, the system should find its limit, at least for the present, until another very great work should be done, which will be pointed out before this paper is finished. For this conclusion there appear to be some very good reasons.

1. *Higher education, than is afforded in and below the Grammar School, is not necessary to good citizenship.* Of course the higher education is desirable. High intelligence is tributary to elevation, national influence and happiness, and very desirable to individuals, but not indispensable in the ongoing of government or the discharge of patriotic duty. It would be

well enough if all contributed equally to its support and all enjoyed alike its advantages. But this is absolutely impossible in the nature of the case.

2. At the Grammar School, from the force of circumstances, a majority of the children end their school course. Prof. Shepherd, Superintendent of Public Instruction in Baltimore, in a recent address on education, in that city, admitted that in Baltimore, "not more than three per cent. of the pupils ever enter the High Schools or City College, and not more than thirty-three and one-third per cent. ever pass through the Grammar School course." This admission is of general application. The reasons are ready. By the time the pupils have reached this stage of advancement they have arrived at that age when they can be of service to their parents. It is a fact known to us all that the independently wealthy are few in comparison to the laboring and struggling classes. The parents of the many need the aid of their children as soon as they become serviceable. They must either work at home or go out to learn some self-sustaining business. For even if the parents can do without the wages of the children they find it a heavy burden to sustain and clothe them. In this latter item they become quite expensive. In the Grammar School and upward they must move in the company of the children of the wealthy. These are generally expensively dressed, especially in the cities. Even if the teacher can so far overcome human nature as to treat, with equal warmth and interest, the children in mean and goodly apparel, the evident comparison in dress, so unfavorable, made by the children themselves and carried home and expressed to the parents, literally freezes out and discourages the attendance of the poorer classes. Thus this thins out the ranks of the Grammar Schools and all those above them. Such is the reason why—such the force of circumstances by which the higher grades of public schools are filled almost altogether by the children of the wealthy. This absolute inability on the part of many of the middle, and all the poorer classes, to sustain and adequately clothe their children while passing through the upper grades, is causing those higher Public

Schools to utterly fail of the object in their institution. They were intended to educate the children of the poor, so as to make them good citizens. That is what they profess to do now, but they are utterly out of the reach of the classes which they were intended to benefit, and they are growing more so every year.

3. The support of the higher schools by public funds is a manifest injustice to a portion of our citizens. It is a principle, we think, admitted by all, that no one part of the citizens of a country should be taxed for the exclusive benefit of another. Especially should not the poor thus be compelled to contribute to the exclusive benefit of the wealthy. Yet this very injustice is practiced in the sustenance of these higher grades of public schools. For whatever may be said of the *right* of the poor to avail themselves of their advantages, the case renders it practically impossible. But the middle and poorer classes that may own their unpretending tenements, must make their yearly contributions through the taxes, to the support of the higher grades of schools, from which their children are practically excluded. The injustice is manifest. It needs no lengthy course of logic to discover and feel it. It is creating great discontent—and justly—among those who are not able to express it.

At a public meeting held, this year, in Allentown, Pa., to devise means to lessen the tax burden, after building a high school at a cost of $120,000, the Judge of the Court stated, that just before coming to the meeting, a poor widow had been to see and consult him as to how she could be able to hold her humble dwelling. The only lien against it was that of $28 tax, the greater part of which was for school purposes. She was likely to lose her home by means of sustaining a school of the higher order for others. Yet this is but one of a thousand instances which might, if sought out, be brought to light.

4. The grades above the Grammar School are more expensive to the public than those below. They are more expensive the higher up they rise. And they cost the public more than the colleges and private schools of the same grade cost

their patrons. Of course, the higher the grade of school, the more costly the building and apparatus must be. Higher talent in the teachers must be employed. And it is known that the principals and teachers of the public high schools receive much larger salaries than the most learned professors in our Colleges. This adds materially to the discontent of the classes of tax payers who feel the burden. A wealthy business man of Baltimore said to us—It would be cheaper for Baltimore city to send every one of the students that attends Baltimore city College, to Penna. College, and pay the whole bill for boarding, tuition, books and travel, than to sustain that Institution as it is conducted. This man ought to know, for he has educated sons at Gettysburg.

Take the State Normal School as another example. These are partly supported by State appropriations. They are a part of the public school system. There is no doubt that schools are necessary for the improvement and full preparation of teachers. But, as conducted, they are certainly very costly institutions. The most successful one in Pennsylvania had, last year, 700 students. It received from the State an appropriation of no less then $30,000. Neither was the appropriation of last year singular. But at this same institution, the charges for boarding, tuition, &c., are as high as those of the Colleges and private schools of the same grade, which receive no appropriations. That is, the student pays as much for the education he gets at a State Normal School as he would pay at a private school or College, and the State pays its thousands beside. Truly this is not economy for the general public. But besides this—if our Colleges and private schools of a higher order had seven hundred students each through the year, and received the pay from each pupil which these State Normal Schools do, they could pay a percentage *to the State* instead of asking for appropriations. Is not the case made out that the higher public schools are more expensive to the public than the Colleges to their patrons?

5. But all the property of private schools, even of higher order than the Public High and State Normal Schools, *is taxed*

to support these public institutions. Now, if higher education is an object, it is equally so when produced in the private school as in the public. It is therefore a manifest injustice to carry on the latter at the expense of the former. It is the State engaged in the business of suppressing one agency for education, which costs it nothing, to build up another, which costs it all. It is the State engaged in putting down private schools to build up—not the Public Schools—but *an order* of Public Schools. All fair minds must see that there is manifest wrong, where all the citizens that are engaged in legitimate business, have not equal privileges and do not stand with equal rights before the law. It is not only wrong, but impolitic for the State, engaged in education, to discourage and suppress any legitimate agency which, at its own expense, is contributing to the same result.

6. In addition to this, in Pennsylvania *there is an unjust discrimination* made in favor of State Normal Schools, and against private schools and Colleges, in *the matter of certificates issued to teachers.* The thorough preparation of teachers for Public Schools, is admitted to be a most important desideratum. The State Normal Schools have been instituted for this purpose. They do not stop at that of course, but take in all classes of students, and thus run opposition to private schools and Colleges. They now imagine that to be a part of their mission. But the course is only partial and rather technical than full, broad and comprehensive. It is not arranged for the general development of mind, but the preparation of the teachers for their work in the lower schools. A diploma given after this practical course, is a permanent certificate, and constitutes the possessor a professional teacher, and after two years' practice makes him free of all other examinations. These privileges are not accorded to the students of private schools, or even the graduates of our Colleges, no matter what the length or breadth of the course through which they have passed or with what thoroughness. This is a discrimination calculated to drive the majority of the students into the State Normal Schools and increase the number, at the expense of the private schools and Colleges. That is, the State is enga-

ged in the suppression of one class of schools that costs it nothing, to build up another which it must support. It makes the Colleges and private schools support their rivals by contribution of students and taxes.

Now all this might be tolerated; nay, we would say, let it go on till every College and private school in the land should be closed up, if the higher Public Schools were doing a work which they could not do, or if they were doing the whole work of education better and cheaper than the Colleges are able to do it. We have shown already that the cheapness is on the side of Colleges. And we now affirm, without fear of contradiction, that the Public High Schools are not doing nearly as broad and thorough work. The text-books used are mere epitomes of the subjects—extracts from the full discussion as contained in the text-books of the Colleges. Then the course in these schools is a partial one—limited to a few branches peculiar to the profession of teaching. There is no broad, comprehensive course, taking in all the departments of science. Yet they produce graduates, who suppose themselves to be educated, when they are only qualified to enter the Preparatory Department. The talk about these higher Public Schools being more thorough than the Colleges is mere twaddle. Nobody knows their deficiency so well as the Professors of the Colleges before whom the so-called graduates come for examination. The truth is, the country is being deceived on this subject, and the thousands of youth that might be educated, are being turned out upon the world with a defective course. They have never learned to think. They cannot originate, and they only become the subservient followers of some stronger or better educated mind. Until the higher Public Schools come to be able to do the work of the Colleges *better* than they do—until they come up and do it *cheaper* to the whole community than they do—let them leave the track clear for the running of the Colleges from the Grammar School on up!

7. We hear of late of a new project on foot to cap the climax of Public Schools. We refer to the projected great *National University*. For this the late Banks' School Bill was to

be the entering wedge. A wilder, more foolish, unfeasible scheme was never projected. Of course, the object of this great school would be to educate youth in the principles of national government in this republic. Let us ask a few questions about its conduct.

If in addition to the usual branches of science the principles of republican government be taught—we would ask which? —Republican or Democratic principles? Or, would it be as in other institutions of the government—would the instruction change with the administration? Or who would be the Professors? Would these be Republicans or Democrats—or would they, with the trustees, all change with the President of the United States? What would be the policy of such a school? Would it be free trade, revenue tariff, or mere protection to industry? What morals would be taught—religion is out of the question? Would they be Jewish or Christian, Buddhist or Mormon, Infidel or Universalist, Romish or Protestant? Or, would they ignore the subject of morals altogether, and make the institution a body without a soul? We suppose that neither the Bible nor the Koran, nor Joe Smith's Book of Mormon could he read there. We have asked these questions simply to show the difficulties that must surround any such enterprise. For on none of these questions could the different parties in this country agree. Such an institution could accomplish nothing, except to become a vast disbursing agency of the public monies placed in the hands of corrupt politicians.

We think we have now presented a pretty clear idea of what the public schools in this country are. It will be seen by this, that the relation *supposed* to exist between these and the Colleges, is that the former are to supersede the latter. By the expressions and flings in the public addresses of the advocates of public school inflation, they appear to view the Colleges as obsolete, if not effete, institutions. The relation then, which the public school system in the hands of these men, has *assumed*, is that of hostility to the Colleges. We say *assumed*, because no such real relation exists. They have assumed to fill the place and perform the work of the Colleges. They have

failed, and they must continue to fail, to do so as long as schools are used as tools in the hands of partisan politicians. The sneers and jeers of the leaders in this uncalled for crusade, will not increase the efficiency of the Public Schools, nor lessen the usefulness of the Colleges. They only show the shallowness of the brains of those who assume this causeless opposition. They show how utterly selfish they are in their motives, and how incapable of rising to the comprehension of the great question of human rights and human elevation. This exhibits the utter unworthiness of such men to be leaders of society.

The writer does not wish to be understood as opposed to the Public School system. He is just the opposite. But as its friend and that of the country and our race, he would point out where it has transcended its province, and where it has failed to do what is most necessary and what was originally intended in its institution. If the system be remanded to its legitimate sphere, which it has entirely transcended, it has a field of unlimited usefulness. It has a province of its own, distinctly and clearly marked out, and which no other agency can fill. It is the field of operation defined by its founders in the inception of the system. It is the *elementary education of the poor.* It is the intellectual elevation of those who have no means for their own education. It is the prevention of the rising up of dangerous classes in society. It is the instruction, mental and moral, of the children of the *abject poor*, so that they may grow to be good citizens.

This is a field into which no private school or College can enter. It has peculiar difficulties, but not insurmountable by the law and the government. Other nations have found it necessary to enter this field, and we must too, if we would not soon pass the acme of our national prosperity. Ignorance and crime go hand in hand, and they will find haunts in seclusion, where they darken and fester till light penetrates to them, and authority brings them forth to correction. They grow deeper and stronger as a nation grows older. They are especially extended in the older and larger cities.

Let us look a little into this interesting field. In the State of New York, there are within the age of pupilage, 1,583,064 children. Of these there are enrolled in the Public Schools only 1,059,238. This leaves out of the Public Schools 523,826. Of this number of children in the State, and left out of the Public Schools, there must be a portion attending private schools and Colleges. We turn to the report of the number of scholars in the latter institutions. We find the whole number attending them to be 178,451. This number subtracted from the number left out of the Public Schools must leave the number now left without education in any school. We find the number of children in the State of New York, including the cities, who do not attend any schools, to be 345,375. Let us come a little nearer home. In the State of Maryland, the whole number of children within the age of pupilage is 276,120. Of this number there are enrolled in all the Public Schools only 142,992. This leaves out of the Public Schools 133,128. By the same process as that applied to the State of New York, we find the number of pupils in the private schools and Colleges to be 44,376; and this taken from the whole number not enrolled in the Public Schools, leaves 88,752 children in the State of Maryland, that do not attend any schools public or private. In 1873, the number of childen within the age of pupilage in Pennsylvania, was 1,200,000. Of these, in 1876, there were enrolled in the Public Schools 902,305—in the private schools and Colleges 27,565—in all the schools 929,870 children. This leaves out of all schools 270,130 pupils in Pennsylvania. We thus see that in New York, 20 per cent. of the children are without schools, in Maryland, 33 per cent., and in Pennsylvania, 22 per cent. Add these three together, and divide by three, to form an average and we have in these three States, 25 per cent. of the children without schools, or, at least, schooling. These three States are not below the average of the Union, but above. And when we consider that in fact, they are among the foremost in educational facilities, we may judge what the compass, if swept around the the circle of the whole United States, would enclose. We

tremble to look at the conclusion to which this leads us—that 25 per cent, or one fourth of the children of the United States, are without instruction! And yet when we take the "Report of the Commissioner of Education" at Washington, as our authority, these are the startling results. Look at the hungry millions of children crying for the crumbs of education to the Public School system, while it is building hundred-thousand-dollar school houses, and spending hundreds of thousands more, in running opposition to Colleges and private schools! Look at all this done at the cost of the poor, that can scarcely pay the tax on the humble cottage he lives in, as much as at the cost of the rich, and yet all inures to the exclusive advantage of the wealthy! Listen to the prayer of 704,257 children in New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania—the prayer of one fourth of the children in our land—for the light of education, and then tell us—Does the Public School system perform its legitimate functions? Has it not transcended its province and left its appropriate work undone? Is it accomplishing the object of its original institution? Is it doing the thing now that to this country and the world is the most important?

Let the Public School system change its policy! Let it alter the direction of its aspirations and efforts! Let it exert its efficiency downward from the grammar school to the totally ignorant, instead of upward to the standard of Colleges. Let the State through this agency go down to and raise up these neglected millions! Here is a field worthy of the expenditure of its thousands and the exertion of its best energies. It can change the coming stream of paupers to become worthy citizens and producers. It can lessen the number of the rabble. It can dissolve the material for strikes and riots. It can subtract from the population of our jails and almshouses. It can remove the causes of local strife and internecine bloodshed. It can lessen the necessity for a standing army to put down insurrections among our own citizens. It can reach and destroy ignorance—the most dangerous element in a republic. For if our republic ever falls, it will not be stricken down by the hand of the elevated, the pure and

the educated. It will be because the ignorance of the people disqualifies them for self-government.

But how can the Public Schools reach the elements of these dangerous classes? How bring them forth and teach them? The answer is not at all difficult. It can be done by *compulsory education*—compulsory in the city—compulsory in the country. It not only can, but it *must* be done so—and the sooner the better. We had once thought this an innovation and an imposition in our free country. But familiarity with the streets and alleys, lined with tenement houses, in New York—three years of pastoral experience in the city of Philadelphia, and four years business circulation among the haunts and scenes of Baltimore, have convinced us that compulsory education by the agency of the Public School system, is the only salvation of our country. The figures we have presented convey some idea of the number, but none of the ignorance, meanness and degradation of the ragged, unwashed, and untaught thousands that swarm along these streets and alleys. No appeal to shame or honor can reach them. They are beneath the reach of all moral reformatory measures. Nothing but a numerous and rigid police force can reach the case. These must be armed with authority to search every tenement and bring forth every truant urchin to the schools. Sufficient plain school houses must be furnished, of which there are not now, in any city, sufficient. The discipline must begin with washing and cleansing. The second process must be the improvement of clothing till the body is covered. The third may be an attempt at order; but it will be accomplished only by authority of the police-club. The fourth may be an effort at teaching some letters.

This rising population *must* be sought out, educated and controlled. The life of this republic depends upon it. The sooner it is understood and begun the better. This stream of human life—deep and wide and hopelessly corrupt—is flowing into the waters of society. As it has a voice in politics, it becomes a factor in the social problem. It is not now controlled by reason, intelligence, or good judgment. It is brutal. It is lawless. It is trained to misdemeanor and wick-

edness Every touch it has received has made it more vicious. The stream flows. It has been flowing for years. It has filled the channels of influence. It is threatening to burst its confines and spread its moral blight widely over the land. To the public school system, with compulsory education alone, can we look for a permanent relief from this flood of corruption. Here is the legitimate, the necessary, work of the Public Schools. Until this class of children are reached and moulded, turned from a corrupting element to the production of good citizens—it is *folly*,it is *suicidal*, for the State to devote the school fund to the erection of costly edifices and the education of the few wealthy.

And now after the definition of the proper sphere of the Public Schools, it will not be difficult to show their true relation to the Colleges. That relation is not one of *opposition*, as has been supposed. It is not one of *hostility*, as the Public School friends have assumed. These are *not* the true relation. The Public Schools are subsidiary—the Colleges supplementary. The Public Schools are preparatory—the Colleges the completion. There is a distinct sphere for each of them, and a great work for each to do.

1. *The Colleges are capable of doing all the work now accomplished by the Public School system from the Grammar School up.* It will not be denied that they can teach all the branches. It may be doubted whether they can accommodate the numbers. But what College is full to overflowing? Let the students of the Colleges be increased, and their accommodations will be enlarged proportionately, and that without cost to the general public. At this date the majority of them are not filled to over half their capacity. When the minds come to be educated, the material appliances will spring up without a taxation of the people. It may be objected that fewer would be educated—that many who are now in the higher Public Schools could not bear the cost of boarding and tuition in the Colleges. There would be a few such, but very few. There are very few now in the higher Public Schools who would be unable to bear their expense in the Colleges. This we

have shown already, and that they could do it more easily than the poor, who own a little property, can pay it for them in the form of taxes. But what is education? Is it not facility, gained by practice, in overcoming difficulties? If so, are not the difficulties to be overcome, in obtaining an education, a part of that education itself? What makes the world think the self-made men the most efficient? Why, there is truth in it. He has had two courses. He has struggled against difficulties and overcome them. And he has done this while he was undergoing his mental discipline. He is twice educated in the same time. Hence he is strong, he is great in intellectual capacity and moral courage. The contrast between him and those who have been reared in the lap of luxury is very evident. It is little less so between him and the poor, who have had everything—tuition, board, and books, furnished by their parents or the public. These have never been called on to make any effort except at their lessons, and they are now graduated babies. Intellectually they are men. Morally, and in force of character, they are pygmies. The world is filling up with them and they are wandering around for some easy thing to do. Any young man or woman, who has energy of character enough to be useful to the world, can now obtain an education, even outside of the Public Schools, such as to fit him or her to fill the highest place in society.

2. The Colleges are capable of doing the work referred to *better and more efficiently than it is being done by the Public Schools.* They cultivate a higher standard and lay a broader basis of education. We know that many people think the contrary. But they are those who either are not capable, or have had no opportunity of fairly judging. But we find it out when the graduates of these Public Schools come for examination to enter the Colleges. The prescribed course is more extended. It is longer. It comprehends subjects not touched in the Public Schools. It treats the same subjects more thoroughly, because its text books are a more extensive, thorough and accurate discussion of those subjects.

3. *The Colleges lay the foundation for opinion according to truth—not partisan principles.* Colleges are not dependent on

any party, section or administration for their support. Hence they have no one set of principles to propagate. If worthy of the name they bear, they are Institutions where the pure truth is sought and taught for its own sake. But *any* of their courses is not prepared so much for the amount of truth conveyed, as for the *thoroughness* of discipline produced. To give men ability to *think* for themselves, is infinitely more important to them, than to pour into them any amount of prepared truths. With a disciplined mind they can investigate and gain truth for themselves. They can add truth to truth, as links to a chain, till they have formed a system of knowledge, or what is a science. A thinker is per force a leader of society, whether he wills it or not. There are plenty of obsequious followers, but few independent thinkers. We need more of them. They are not produced by the superficial or partial course of the Public Schools, as they are by the broader, more thorough course of the Colleges.

4. *The Colleges are the natural leaders in the pursuit of true Science.* There is much written and published, in these days of hurried thought, that is science falsely so called. The truth of this is proven by the fact, that what we receive as settled conclusion this year, is by authority equally as great overthrown and set aside the next. It is the privilege and province of the college professors—each one of whom has his own specialty—to pursue, and lead his student to the right conclusions in his own peculiar branch. It is in the Colleges that we find not only all known that is in the books; but professors pushing their investigations beyond the published accounts, into new territories of hitherto unexplored science. At any rate, to these do we rightly and successfully look for correction of the wild theories that come up. Especially do we need this now, when some of the theories advanced tend to overthrow the old settled landmarks of truth. We would not be understood to discourage investigation. On the contrary we say, let the conquests of scientists be pushed as far into the unknown as possible. But when it is done, we may confidently and successfully look to our college professors to tell us what portion is truth.

5. *The Colleges are the conservators of religion.* The conflict of opinion about the Bible in the Public Schools is patent to every one. Whatever may be our position on the subject, the weight of influence, among the friends and managers of Public Schools generally, is falling on the side for rejection. In many sections this is now an accomplished fact. In many more, the Bible is in mere nominal use. Most of the teachers have no interest in its retention. If we are to interpret the sentiment in the Normal Schools by the actions of their graduates after they have come out, we take it that their influence is against the use of the Bible. Under these circumstances our proposition is evident—the Colleges must be the conservators of religion.

They are so up to this time. They do not merely tolerate the Scriptures but make them the text-books of all Sunday teaching. In all instruction, they consider the Bible as containing the basis of all truth. Nor do they give to the principles of Christianity a mere otiose consent. While in a majority of cases they can scarcely be said to be denominational, yet they are positive in the propagation of the doctrines of revelation. We think we may say, that those that are not under the direction of any so called Church, are equally as positive in their teaching of the Scriptures as those that are. To the Colleges we may confidently look for the solution of the supposed conflict between science and revelation. We say *supposed* conflict, because we do not believe that any such conflict is real. The great scare on this subject, on the one hand, and the great flare, on the other, are the result of a rising apparition in partially educated minds. It arises from the imperfect understanding of both science and the Bible. For we are perfectly confident, that God cannot be the author of two conflicting revelations. Nature is one, the Bible is another. The knowledge of nature is science. The truths of the Bible are revelation. When we understand both, we shall find they agree, and that scientific truth rightly interpreted is divine truth. But *government* without religion is an impossibility. Without some appeal to conscience there is no sense of responsibility. Hence

every nation, even if the leaders are unbelievers, has felt it necessary to have the people taught some form of religion.

The least, that religion can now expect from the Public Schools, is inattention. The evident tendency is to opposition. They have repudiated their most potent influence in the formation of national character. They come short of their original intention, which was the unification as well as the elevation of the people. To whom then shall we look, but the Colleges, the Colleges that teach with the *Bible*, to render the public mind homogeneous? To what other power may we turn for the education of conscience, which alone renders government possible? We shall look in vain in any other direction. These alone are left us. These stand as the exponents of truth and the dispensaries of wisdom. These alone—when the Public Schools refuse—form the moral character of the nation. They teach the moral teachers. They give tone to the morality of leading statesmen. They give the fundamental education even to the ministry. To them we must look as the most reliable conservators of religion.

6. *The Colleges are the framers and crystalizers of character.* Whether in time or eternity, character is the principal thing. It is not what people think us—that is reputation; it is not what we think ourselves—that is *conceit;* it is not what is said about us—that is fame, that makes us excellent, or useful, or happy. It is what we really *are* in ourselves and before God, that renders us beneficial to the race in time, and felicitous in eternity. It is character. The moon shines, and to the superficial eye its light seems original. But it gives no aid to vegetation, no tint to the flower, no color to the cheek. It is the *Sun* with his vivifying heat that warms into life the myriads of living creatures in the Solar System. Reputation may dazzle and sprightly genius throw off its corruscations upon an admiring world. But it is excellence of character, that warms into activity the nobler traits of human nature and raises it to a prominent elevation.

This excellence is not gained by the pursuit of a few branches of secular education taught with no attempt at

controlling the moral actions. It is gained only by the steady pursuit of a full and well rounded course, such as to cultivate every mental and moral faculty to the full extent of its capacity. Then all along it must have the word of God as the substratum.

Such a course is found alone in our Colleges. These alone form the character of their students upon the firm moral basis, and these send out the streams of influence to form the national character.

Colleges, then, hold the *first* place, among the educational institutions. Their relation to Public Schools is not one of opposition as is *supposed* by some—not one of hostility as *assumed* by others. They are not obsolete or effete institutions, to be pushed aside and supplanted by the Young American Public School System. They are supplementary—they are up to the most advanced standard. They are advancing, and will be in the van of all other strictly educational institutions. They are the formers and crystalizers of individual and national character. To them must the people look as the leaders of thought, the source of the most advanced intellect, for the training of its greatest statemen, the wisest and most far-seeing legislators, the most learned professors and scientists, the most cultivated and erudite divines, the most just and impartial judges, the most conscientious lawyers, and the most *intelligent, firm, and reliable people.*

ARTICLE III.

THE HUMAN CONDITIONS OF A GOOD PRAYER MEETING.

By L. A. Gotwald, D. D., York, Penn'a.

Ἀλλ' οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικὸν, ἔπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν.—1 Cor. 15 : 46.

Before defining what the human conditions of a good Prayer Meeting are, it may, perhaps, be well first clearly to understand what a truly good Prayer Meeting itself is.

A good Prayer Meeting is an assembly of Christians in which, in answer to the prayers which are there offered, and as the result of reverent meditation upon divine truth in which those who are thus met together there engage, the Holy Ghost bestows the spiritual blessings which God, in His word, has promised to all who, in sincerity and in truth, call upon Him.

These spiritual blessings consist in the increased faith, comfort, moral strength, and holiness, of believers, and in the enlightenment, conviction, and genuine conversion of the hitherto impenitent.

A meeting productive of such true fruits of the Holy Spirit, (Gal. 5 : 22, 23), thus bringing the hearts of the gathered worshipers under the blessed power of the Holy Spirit, and making them the recipients of those Christian graces which, according to God's word, constitute true Christian character, is always a good meeting. It is good because all its elements, all its aims, all its results, are good. It is throughout super-human and divine: its author, God's Spirit; its instrument, God's word; its means, God's appointment; its ground of hope and faith, God's Son; its aim, God's glory; and its result, the genuine and lasting improvement of the moral and religious character of the worshiper.

The realization of such a meeting is, of course, not dependent upon the presence of large numbers. All these re-

sults may exist in a meeting composed of but few persons, as readily as in one composed of many. Christ has promised to be with His people where but two or three have met for prayer in His name, (Math. 18 : 20) and, of course, where Christ is there will, or may be, a good meeting.

As a simple matter of fact, also, nearly all the meetings for prayer, mentioned in the Bible, were small meetings. Experience, also, shows that large numbers in a meeting, instead of being a help to devotion, may prove an actual hindrance to it. The truth is, owing to the distracting and diverting power over our minds of the outer and visible, the greater the number the greater, also, is the danger that the meeting, in the highest and best sense, will not be a good meeting. In a large congregation of people for worship, there is always more or less danger, that some mere semblance of the presence and grace of the Holy Ghost be mistaken for His real presence and grace. The mere sight of a large multitude of people, the physical magnetism induced by close contact with many others, the sympathy awakened by the deep feelings of gathered hundreds around us, the nervous excitement of wild and pathetic addresses or exhortations, the exhilirating thrill of a great volume of song poured forth by the voices of thousands, all of which are purely natural or physical, merely sympathetic and sentimental, destitute in themselves of a single element of grace, all these, nevertheless, may be, and often are, mistaken for the purest and best possible manifestations of the presence and power of the Holy Ghost. Simply because the meeting was large, and the singing was good, and everybody felt good, people often come away pleased, and imagine themselves benefited, and pronounce it a good meeting. Now, a large meeting may, of course, be a very good one ; and there is no actually good reason why it should not be. We simply say, that it is not good because it is large ; and is, indeed, in danger of not being good, or of being defective in true spiritual power and benefit, just in proportion as it is large. Not that there are limitations to the gracious power of the Holy Ghost, or not that God could not, and would not, just as readily bestow

STATE LIBRARY HARRISBURG PENNSYLVANIA

His blessing upon a large Prayer Meeting as He would upon a small one, but simply because there is so much in a large meeting to distract and divert the mind, to absorb thought, and enlist interest, that there remains no room often in the heart for the higher and better things of God. A Prayer Meeting, therefore, may be good even though the number present be small, and may not be good even though attended by thousands.

The thought may, also, here be subjoined, that a good Prayer Meeting is not necessarily characterized by much feeling, and at no time admits the existence of disorder and confusion, (1 Cor. 14 : 33, 40). Many persons judge the value of a devotional meeting, or of a religious service of any kind, entirely by the degree of emotion or feeling which they experience whilst in it. If they felt good, if they were moved to tears, if their sympathies and sensibilities were deeply stirred, if possibly they became so happy as to shout and leap and clap their hands and then swoon away in a kind of sweet religious intoxication, they call the meeting a good meeting. And yet, to them, at least, there was nothing whatever good in it. It brought them nothing- It was simply the play of excitement upon their nervous system. It was all no more than the kindled blaze of their own imagination. There was not perhaps a particle of grace in it. They were not made holier, or better, or stronger in Christian character by it. On the contrary, the meeting was really a moral injury to them. It only served to confirm them in their false and unscriptural conceptions of religion. It simply helped still more to delude them with regard to what constitutes true and acceptable worship.

A good Prayer Meeting is good only in so far as it really makes those who engage in it morally better; not simply, in some way, makes them *feel* good whilst in it, but which actually *makes* them good, and which, when once the meeting is over, and they have gone back again into their families and shops, and stores, and are again beset by the temptations and trials of life, helps to keep them good. There was a

STATE LIBRARY HARRISBURG PENNSYLVANIA

great deal of emotion, and a vast amount of bodily exercise, in that "all day" Prayer Meeting which those four hundred priests of Baal, in the days of Elijah, held on the top of Mount Carmel. It was, indeed, a very *feeling* meeting. They called, we read, upon their god from morning until noon, saying, "Oh Baal, hear us; Oh Baal, hear us." They leaped upon the altar which they had made, they cried aloud and even cut themselves until the blood gushed out upon them. (1 Kings 18: 26—29.) There was no lack of feeling, surely, in that Prayer Meeting. But still it was not a *good* Prayer Meeting. It was, in fact, a really bad one. It was a wild, fanatical, heathen Prayer Meeting. There was no pure piety in it; no Holy Spirit in it; no real and true praying in it; and no answer to the prayers which arose upon the air from it. Elijah, on the other hand, was not moved by a tithe of their excited feeling; made no such physical demonstrations as they made; was calm, thoughtful, assured, rested confidently upon the naked promises and power of God; and yet his was the prayer which that day was marvellously answered, (1 Kings 18: 38.) Elijah's praying was good praying. And hence, a few persons or many, possessing this spirit of Elijah, and coming together in some one suitable place, and there pouring out their united prayers would make a capital Prayer Meeting. Such a meeting would, indeed, be a good meeting.

In seeking, then, to estimate the moral character and value of a devotional service, we see that such character and value are not to be determined by the mere glare of larger numbers, nor by the degree only in which the emotional nature of the worshiper is touched, but by the measure in which it helps the soul into a clearer apprehension of the true nature and being of God, a more humbling view of its own sinfulness and weakness and need of Christ, a better understanding of divine truth, a purer faith, a warmer love, a more intelligent and well-founded hope, a more intense holiness both of heart and life, a more reverent and filial fear and obedience, the reception, in a word, in harmonious proportion and relation

to each other, of fuller measures of all the graces of the Holy Ghost. (John 6 : 63 ; 1 Tim. 4 : 8.)

With this as our conception of what is a good Prayer Meeting, we turn now to ask : *What are some of the human conditions of a good Prayer Meeting.* That is, what are some of the means which we ourselves must provide and employ in order to secure to ourselves a good Prayer Meeting ? Or, in other words, how must we so arrange for our Prayer Meeting, and then conduct it, that the Holy Ghost can and will, in harmony both with His own laws of action, and in harmony with the principles and laws which govern our own moral being, convey Himself to us, and act upon us so as to produce within us His own true and saving work ?

To many it may seem strange that we should speak of *human* conditions of a good Prayer Meeting ; or should intimate that there are certain things entirely under our control by which we may always have a good meeting, and by disregarding which we can seldom or never have it. Many will say : "We always thought that a good Prayer Meeting depended upon the Holy Ghost ; that He is sovereign, that He is ever present in the assembly of believers, and that He works when and where and as it pleases Him." And they are right. All that they thus say is true. For all spiritual quickening, all pure enjoyment in worship, all moral and religious benefit flowing to us from waiting upon God, comes, of course, through the agency upon our hearts of the Holy Ghost, "who in His own time and place works faith in those that hear the Gospel." (Augsburg Confession, Art. V.) But, it must also be remembered, the Holy Ghost whilst thus divine and sovereign, nevertheless carries on His operations in our hearts *according to law* ; not a law outside of and above Himself, but according to a self-imposed and divine law as He Himself "listeth." (John 3 : 8.)

Whether we are able always to designate the cause or not, we yet all know it to be simply a fact, that the Holy Spirit, for some reason, does *not* always, in our devotional meetings, exercise or manifest His power alike. Some meetings, by all present, are declared good. Every heart is made to feel

the quickening and comforting presence of the Holy Spirit. But other meetings, held in the same place, and engaged in by substantially the same persons, are entirely the reverse; dull, wearisome, cold, unprofitable, devoid of all tenderness and spiritual life and power. Now, what is the explanation of this difference? Is the Holy Spirit *occasional* only in His presence in religious assemblies? Is He *mutable* in His disposition to operate on the hearts of God's people? Is He more willing to bless Christians in answer to their prayers at one time than He is at other times? To suppose *this* to be the case would be to deny His divinity; for mutability can only inhere in imperfect beings, and can never be predicated of a divine being. The difference in the tone or spiritual character of our religious meetings arises then from some cause or source *other* than the Holy Ghost. He is always present, and always both willing and able to impart His gracious influence upon us, and to make our meeting a profitable and good one.

Nor is the cause of the difference always in ourselves. The value to us of all public or social worship is, we admit, largely determined by our own subjective frame, by the spirit with which we engage in it, and no religious service will prove profitable to us unless we are spiritually fitted for it. But is it not often the case that, even when we have this preparation, when our hearts yearn for communion with God, when they really glow with love and faith, and when we go to the place of prayer with bright expectations of a precious hour with our fellow Christians at the Mercy Seat, we are bitterly disappointed, and come away unblessed? How often, even under such circumstances, has not something occurred which has thrown a chill over the whole service? And how often has it not been the case that from some cause, a mere trifle perhaps in itself, the meeting to which we thus looked forward with so much bright anticipation, instead of being a good one, was felt by all to be a failure, without encouragement or strength or help to any one.

There are, then, in every good Prayer Meeting not only the divine element of the presence and power of the Holy Ghost,

but also human elements. There are divine conditions, and there are also certain absolutely necessary human conditions. Some of the essentials of a good Prayer Meeting must come from God, and must always be present, and without them, no matter how perfect may be the human arrangements, there can be no really good meeting. (1 Cor. 3 : 6, 7.) But, on the other hand, there are also purely human factors, essentials which come from man, which we ourselves must furnish, which the Holy Ghost, although He is divine and could act independently of all conditions, nevertheless ordinarily first requires before He bestows His blessings upon us, and without which, in short, there is not ordinarily either a pleasant or a profitable worship. When Elijah built his altar, the arrangement of the material was *his* work, the cleaving of the wood was *his* work, the placing of the sacrifice upon it was *his* work, but the sending down of fire from heaven to consume it was *God's* work. Abraham, we are told, waited for the burning lamp, the symbol of the Divine Presence. But if he had not taken the pieces of the heifer, and of the turtle doves, and placed them over against each other, he would not have had a way through which the smoking furnace and the burning lamp could—or, at least, would—have passed before him. When the angel touched the offering of Gideon with his staff, and there arose fire out of the rock and consumed it, he did so because the offering was what was commanded, and was placed where it was commanded to be placed, and where the angel, without hindrance, could touch and consume it. There were, in each of these cases, *divine* conditions and *human* conditions, and the divine operated *through* the human, and made itself dependent, in its action, *upon* the human, and produced the results of its presence and power only when once the human were all proper and favorable. And this, in worship, is ordinarily always the case. A divine and human agency are forever working together. God is, of course, not, in any way, dependent upon us. The Holy Spirit can, if He will, at any time, and in any place, display His power in the conversion of souls and edification of believers. But it is simply a fact, that He does not ordinarily

choose to do so. He limits Himself by human conditions. He will not run counter to, but according to, the natural and physical laws of man's being. He does not, in bestowing the gifts of His grace, set aside the necessity of the exercise of reason or of ordinary common sense. He deals with man as an intelligent and rational being. He conforms Himself especially to him as a *moral* being, approaching and influencing him, not through the avenue of the senses, but by the medium of God's truth, through the channel of the understanding and will. He operates, in a word, in complete harmony with the laws which regulate the action of mind upon mind and of spirit upon spirit.

This is the order or method of the Holy Spirit's operations on the human soul. And hence, in the conduct of a Prayer Meeting, or of any religious service, to have it a *good* meeting, *i. e.* to secure the fullest possible spiritual benefit, as the outcome or result of the meeting, there must be a recognition of, and compliance with, these human conditions upon which the Holy Spirit ordinarily alone draws near to the soul of the worshiper, and exercises His power.

Simply as an illustration of the truth of what we have now said, and without meaning by our reference, even indirectly, to indorse the modern system of lay evangelism, look at the wise regard to favorable human conditions exercised, in the conduct of his public religious services, by Mr. Moody, the noted revivalist. His immense popularity, and his usefulness to whatever extent he is really useful, are both very largely owing to his remarkable wisdom in this special respect. Beyond question, he is, to begin with, a man of much more than ordinary intellectual power. He has also great physical vigor. He is also, without doubt, an humble, sincere and earnest Christian. And he leans, at every step in his work, we have reason to believe, prayerfully upon the Holy Ghost for all spiritual success. He says and believes that the one only author of all true spiritual life, is the Holy Ghost, and the one only instrument, is His own inspired or divine word. And yet Mr. Moody does not expect the Holy Ghost to work for the conviction and conver-

sion of sinners and the edification of believers, until all the human conditions for thus working are perfected and favorable. And hence, he first secures these favorable conditions, physical, mental, and moral, and then, holding the reins firmly in his own hands, he also, during all the protracted service, keeps them favorable. There is in his whole work marvelous *management.* He thoroughly understands human nature. He knows just how men must first be conditioned before even the Holy Spirit, operating upon them as moral beings through the truth, can reach and impress them. And hence observe what admirable pre-arrangements for his services he always makes, and how skillfully and wisely he conducts them. Union and concert of purpose among different pastors and churches—previous and continued prayer among Christians for God's blessing upon the proposed work—the publication of the services in the papers, and personally, far and near—the securing of a thoroughly suitable auditorium, large, airy, well ventilated, properly heated, easily accessible, attractive, comfortable, adapted so that the truth spoken may be most easily and impressively heard—the previous appointment of committees, made up of the best men and women of the different churches, for every possible kind of Christian work which may be required—the selection of a large number of ushers to seat the people comfortably and to prevent all discomfort and confusion—the formation of a large and select choir, led by a famous and competent organist and singer—all these and many others, are the mere *pre*-arrangements, the *preparation* only for the work. And now enter the meeting, and see how the same regard for favorable human conditions continues. The atmosphere and temperature are perfect. The audience is entirely comfortable. Everybody is in just the best possible condition to join in the services. Everything is encouraging and inspiring. Every one is awake, and hopeful, and expecting a good meeting. The hymns sung are familiar, and rendered with heart and soul by the whole multitude. The prayers offered are subdued, pertinent, brief. And then Mr. Moody rises to speak. But first the doors are all locked, so that neither he nor his audience shall

be disturbed by people running in and out all the time. And now he proceeds. He has a subject, knows just what he wants to say, aims to make some one impression, to accomplish some one object, sticks to it, drives it home, is plain, full of illustrations, interesting, earnest, short, stops when he is done. And then come more singing and more praying, but there is unity of thought and sentiment and aim in it all. All is wisely arranged beforehand, and made to fall into line at the right time and place, and each successive exercise is adapted to intensify and deepen the impression of every preceding exercise. And, during it all, there is the rigid enforcement of the strictest possible order; no noise nor confusion, no audible amens nor pious ejaculations, no clapping of hands nor shouting, but silence, decorum, order.

Such, in outline, is the character of Mr. Moody's meetings. They are, all must confess, so far as management is concerned conceived and carried on with masterly wisdom and common sense. All the physical, mental, moral, and spiritual conditions, subject to his control, and which he may deem necessary or helpful toward securing a pleasant and profitable hour of worship, are beforehand provided for, and thus the way of the Lord is prepared, the highway cast up, the stones gathered out, the standard for the people uplifted, (Isaiah 62: 10), and the fullest possible opportunity, without obstacle or hindrance, afforded to the Holy Spirit, through the truth as contained in the Sacred Scriptures, to find for Himself an entrance into the hearts of those who are assembled.

But, in contrast with religious services thus conducted, look now, for a moment, at our average congregational Prayer Meetings, as conducted in our different churches. Where is there even an approach to this wise regard for favorable human conditions in worship? How general the feeling: It is only a prayer meeting—it does not matter much what may be the condition of things. How often everything is delegated to the wisdom of some most unwise and most indolent sexton. And how terrible and sad are not, also, the results. The place often dingy and dirty and dark; the air foul and feverish and faint; the temperature

either hot or cold, the lights dim, the seats uncomfortable, the walls cob-webbed, the floor unswept, no one previously appointed to conduct the services, or the one appointed making his appearance late, and then unprepared when he does come; the Scripture lesson selected at random and long and tedious, the attempted explanation still longer and more tedious; the hymns chosen at hap-hazard,* inappropriate, with no relation to each other or to the scripture reading;

*The writer recalls some amusing experiences in connection with this bad habit of carelessness in the selection of hymns in public worship.

He well remembers, for instance, how, years ago, when he was yet a student in the Theological Seminary, a fellow student, whose duty it was to conduct "morning prayers," having slept longer than he should, and who, in consequence, came in late and without preparation, assumed to "lead the meeting," once made a very unfortunate selection. Snatching up the book, and glancing merely at the first line or two, and satisfied with as much of it as he thus hurriedly had read, he announced the hymn, beginning with the words: "See Israel's gentle Shepherd stand," &c., a hymn adapted throughout only to the occasion of the baptism of a child. It need hardly be said that the singing of that hymn was no help to our devotion that morning, especially when we came to sing the third verse:

"We bring them, Lord, with grateful hearts
And yield them up to Thee;
Rejoiced that we ourselves are thine,
Thine let our offspring be!"

He recalls, also, how, in his early ministry, in a congregational Prayer Meeting, held on a bright and most beautiful Easter Sunday morning, just after he had spoken on the theme of "Our Risen Saviour our Ground of Joy," and when, as he hoped, he had succeeded in filling every heart with feelings of praise and gladness, a weak but well-meaning brother arose and, in sepulchral tones, and with an awfully solemn visage, said, that "our dear pastor's remarks" had brought to his mind a favorite hymn of his which he deemed so "suitable to the occasion", that he would now announce it, and then actually announced that most dreadful of all hymns that were ever penned:

"Hark! from the tomb, a dreadful sound,
Mine ears attend the cry!"

Nor has he forgotten the annoyance which another irrepressible brother, in Prayer Meetings, was to him for years in the blunders which,

the singing nasal, discordant, without harmony, or taste, or adaptation to the sentiment; the prayers cold, aimless, made up of commonest platitudes and of old and oft repeated forms, offered by men who hate the very sight of liturgic forms; the silence and solemnity of the services broken by this one coming in and that one passing out, by this one fumbling over his hymn book during prayer looking for a hymn, and that one responding and praying aloud to the annoyance of all around him, this one rudely hawking and spitting and that one suddenly indulging in some nasal blast like the startling sound of some mighty trumpet; a dozen or a hundred different things to offend one's taste, and to chill and destroy the spirit of one's devotion; the services throughout dull and tiresome and unprofitable; everybody weary and exhausted, and, at last, when the hour is up, everybody glad that it is up, and that the meeting is over.

Now *that*, a little exaggerated perhaps, is a picture of what generally passes in our churches as the congregational Prayer Meeting; a meeting that ought to be the most attractive and encouraging and profitable, next to the regular preaching of God's word, on the Lord's Day, in which the members of our churches could engage; where the presence and power of the Holy Ghost should be especially felt; where under His free and unhindered influences every soul should be filled with joy, and warmed and quickened into new spiritual life; but which, in actual experience and fact, is, as a general thing, the dullest, the most poorly attended, the least attractive, the least profitable of all our church services; aimless, lifeless, powerless, fruitless.*

---

in this respect, he continually made. The hymn with which he was most familiar, and which he used on every possible occasion, was the hymn, "Alas and did my Saviour bleed," and always with the chorus, at the close of each verse, "Oh that will be joyful, joyful, joyful, &c."

Other similar incidents might be given to show, that there is such a thing as "fitness" in our selection of hymns in public worship; and that a thoughtless or ignorant disregard of this fitness, will very quickly and successfully destroy both the pleasure and spiritual benefit of a religious meeting.

* "The Prayer-Meeting constitutes so important a part of the Chris-

Nor is it difficult to point out the *cause* of such a state of things. The cause lies very largely in our disregard of those human conditions in worship upon which alone the Holy Ghost, morally speaking, can, as a Spirit, touch and impress our spirits, and, by means of the truth of God's word savingly affect us.

---

tian social life of this country, and is so much a thing of the people that it is legitimately a topic for the examination and discussion of laymen. We approach the subject with abundant reverence for the time-honored estimate of its usefulness, and only with a wish for the advancement of its efficiency as an agency for spiritual culture. That it is in any respect the boon that it should be to the hundreds of thousands who attend upon and participate in its exercises, no one pretends. That it is the lamest and most nearly impotent of any of the agencies employed by the church, in perhaps two cases out of every three, is evident to all. Let us see if we can present a fair picture of the average Prayer Meeting.

In a church of, say two hundred and fifty members, there is an average attendance of fifty persons. These are made up, so far as the men are concerned, of the principal church officials—the deacons, elders, etc. The remainder are women—the best women of the church—and such of their families as they can induce to accompany them. The clergyman, over worked, and discouraged by the small number in attendance, is there to lead. He gives out his hymn, prays, reads the Scriptures, and, with a few remarks, "throws open the meeting" to the laymen for prayer or exhortation. There is a long period of silence. The deacons, who suspect that their voices have been heard too often, or, that they may be in the way of others, remain silent. At last, either one of them is called upon by the pastor, or some poor man, under the spur of a sense of duty, rises and utters, as well as he can, the words of a prayer. Everybody sees that he is in a struggle, and that he is so little at home that he is only anxious to get through without breaking down. The audience is, of course, sympathetic, and, instead of being led in prayer, becomes as anxious for him as he is for himself. And so, with long patches of embarrassing and painful silence, interspersed with dreary platitudes of prayer and speech, unrefreshing and lacking spontaneity to a sad degree, the meeting goes on to the end, which comes when the chapel clock shows that an hour has been spent in the service. To suppose that any great good comes from the spending of an hour in this way, is to offer an insult to common sense.

It would be instructive, if the facts could be ascertained, to know how many of those who attend the average Prayer Meeting do so be-

But, what are some of these human conditions of a good Prayer Meeting of which we have now been speaking? In answering this question we may, in a general way, remark, that all sanctifying and saving impressions which the Holy Spirit in worship makes upon our hearts, He thus makes through the instrumentality of His own inspired word, as contained in the Holy Scriptures, addressed to our understanding and will, and hence that everything, both subjective and objective, subject to our control, by which the truth of that inspired word, be it spoken, pictured, sung, or prayed,

---

cause they truly delight in it, how many because they wish to stand by and encourage their pastor, and how many because they think it is, or may be, their duty. It would also be instructive, if the facts could be ascertained, to know how many men are kept away by the fear of being called upon to engage actively in the exercises, and how many remain at home because they have learned by experience that the average Prayer Meeting is a dreary place to weary men—one which bores without benefiting them. We fear that if the facts were known as they relate to these points, the average Prayer Meeting would find itself in a very sorry standing. When men go to a religious meeting, of any sort, they go to be reinforced, or refreshed, or instructed. How much of any one of these objects can be realized in such a meeting as we have described? How much of the still higher object of spotaneous, joyous worship can be secured by listening to the painful blundering of some pious and conscientious layman? Is it not the truth that the average Prayer Meeting is a sad mockery of both God and man.

Can it be possible that the Almighty Father of us all is pleased with an offering so little spontaneous, so far from joyous, so painful in its exercises, and so unprofitable in its counsels as this? If, once a week, a whole Church would come together joyfully, and sing their songs, and pray their prayers, and speak their thoughts, and commune with one another on the great topic which absorbs them, that would be a meeting worth having. But how would such a meeting compare with the dead drag of the average Prayer Meeting? It would compare as life compares with death, as beauty with deformity. So utterly valueless, to all human apprehension, are the Prayer Meetings carried on by some churches that it may well be questioned whether they are not rather a detriment than an advantage, a harm rather than a help, to the regular work of the pastors, and the spiritual prosperity of those whom they lead and teach."—*Dr. J. G. Holland in Scribner's Monthly for September, 1877.*

will most favorably be heard, and will most effectually impress itself upon the attention and conscience of the hearer or beholder, is an essential condition of all true worship, and, of course, is a human condition also of every good Prayer Meeting, and is of such vital importance that in all public worship, it should beforehand be most carefully considered and provided for, and should always, both before, during and after each religious service, be complied with most faithfully. Or, to be more specific, these conditions may be classified in something like the following order: the spiritual, the intellectual, the æsthetic, the physical, the executive, and the co-operative. We do not know that this classification is the best that could be made, or that it is sufficiently comprehensive to include each one of the numerous and diversified human conditions affecting worship, but it is good enough and comprehensive enough to answer at least all our present purposes.

1. The first of these classes of human conditions in every good Prayer Meeting, which we mentioned, is *the spiritual*, *i. e.* the subjective religious character of the worshiper himself. A Prayer Meeting is to each of us largely what we ourselves, in our own minds and hearts, are to it. The Holy Spirit in such a meeting must have a spiritual basis in our own moral being upon which to exert His divine agency. He simply touches, and kindles, and consumes with His hallowed flame, the spiritual sacrifice which we, in our worship, bring and lay upon the altar before Him. Of course, if we bring no such sacrifice, there will be nothing for Him to touch, and we will sit in His presence, and pass out again from it, unblessed. If, however, the reverse is the case, the result will also be different. If, *e. g.* a man, is thoroughly godly in his character, holy in his life, spiritually minded, heavenly tempered, his heart glowing with love to God and yearning after deeper and more intimate communion with Him, if such a man comes to the Prayer Meeting, to *him*, because of what he thus already is in himself, it will probably be a good meeting, and will help him on in his Christian life. There is in his own spirituality an already existing appetency or affinity for that which is good, and he will likely find it, just as

the bee finds the honey. Such a soul will, most probably, meet the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost will meet it, and God's truth will be precious to it, even in a meeting where there may be much to quench the Holy Ghost, and withhold and becloud the truth. Subjective spirituality, or deep personal piety, both in character and life, is, then, one necessary human condition of a good Prayer Meeting.

2. The personally *intellectual* is also an important human condition, determining the relative moral and spiritual benefit to us of public worship. The Holy Spirit's one only instrument, as we have already seen, in producing His blessed effects upon us, is the inspired word. This word or truth comes, however, to us primarily through the intellect, by attention, thought, judgment, understanding. The *mental* capacity or condition, therefore, of the worshiper, will, other things being equal, largely determine the relative spiritual benefit to him of the religious services. If he is a man of feeble mental capacity, if he has no power to govern and concentrate his thoughts upon the truth as at the time it is presented, if his mind previous to coming and during the services is full of business and of the cares and perplexities of the world, with no mental room or aptitude for the things of God and the soul and eternity, then, no matter how good the meeting may be in itself, or may be to others, though the leader speak the truth with almost angelic power, and the prayers offered rise from almost inspired hearts, the meeting still to *him* will scarcely prove a good meeting. But, if the reverse of all this is the case, reversed, also, will probably to him be the *result.* His mind being open and susceptible to the truth, the Holy Spirit, also, through the truth, will touch and bless him. This, then, is a second class of human conditions—viz: the intellectual The mind must be in accord with worship.

3. We mention next, as a *third* class of human conditions in pleasant, profitable worship, the *æsthetic.* We use this term to designate everything connected with worship, which has the effect of pleasing or offending the cultivated taste and judgment of those worshiping. There may, we admit, be

entirely too much importance attached by some to this element connected with worship; nor do we wish to intimate that there may not be acceptable and profitable worship even in the almost entire absence of this particular characteristic. But still, taking our congregations as they *are*, *i. e.* composed largely of persons whose tastes are cultivated, whose manners are refined, who have been educated to perceive, appreciate, enjoy, and be benefited by the beautiful in thought, or language, or object, it is simply a fact, that the pleasure and actual spiritual profit of a religious service is to all such persons largely affected by this æsthetic element. Though to you and me with our coarser tastes, and less refinement and culture, such things may not make the least difference, or in the least hinder us from getting good out of the meeting, yet there are those in all our Prayer Meetings, and in all our religious services, to whom it does make a world of difference. The lack of artistic beauty in the room; the discord and want of harmony in the music; the grammatical inaccuracies and blunders of manner and speech of those who speak or lead in prayer; all these things, and many others, we ourselves may not, for a moment, be affected by; but we know many other most admirable Christians whose whole pleasure and benefit in worship, is marred and destroyed, by just such so-called little things as these. Hence we name this *æsthetic* element in worship, this regard for the beautiful and fitting and correct, in word and manner, in appearance and conduct, as another, and by no means an unimportant human condition, which will go far towards helping to make our religious meetings good meetings.

4. The *fourth* class of conditions which we mentioned, as determining the character of our religious services, is the *physical; i. e.* everything affecting the comfort or discomfort of the *body* of the worshiper. This embraces a large number of particulars; for the body may, by many different causes, be either favorably or unfavorably conditioned in worship. The acoustic character of the place as an auditorium; the relative position of the hearer to the speaker; the comparative comfort of the pews or seats; the temperature of the

room; its ventilation or atmospheric condition; all these have a decided power in determining the spiritual interest and benefit of the meeting. For all these affect the body; and so close are the relations of the mind or spirit to the body, that if the body is uncomfortable, the mind or spirit will also be uncomfortable, and cannot worship with interest and profit. How, for example, can you expect a good meeting in a cold house, when everybody is shivering from head to foot? How can you expect a good meeting when the atmosphere in the room is stifling and foul, as is so often the case in our lecture rooms and even churches? It is simply impossible. And right here exists one cause which has made many a meeting a failure. Look at the facts in the case as they occur almost everywhere. The room has, probably, not had a door or window in it open since the last service, and is still filled with the same poisonous and exhausted air which two or three hundred people had then already breathed over and over. About an hour before worship is to begin, the sexton builds the fire, and rings the bell. The people gather. But soon they yawn, and gape, and sneeze, and cough, and grow drowsy and sleepy. The young men utterly fail, and the old men dream dreams in a sense not contemplated by the prophet. The preacher thumps and pounds away to keep the hearers awake. He heaves away like old Sisyphus trying to get the stone up to the top of the hill! But it is all useless. He is dull. The people are dull. Everybody is dull. There is no ring, no spirit, no sympathy, no magnetism in the meeting. The hearers go home unfed, unprofited, throwing the blame on the preacher, saying to each other, "that was rather a poor sermon our preacher gave us to-day." And the preacher as he walks home, says confidentially to his wife, "Well, that was rather a hard congregation to preach to to-day—I am very much discouraged! The Holy Ghost, I fear, is deserting us!" Not so, my brother. Not so, good people of the congregation. You both wrong each other. The fault lies essentially in neither of you. But it lies in the bad physical condition, in which you attempted to worship. You disregarded some of the necessary hygienic laws of spiritual success. You neg-

lected and ran counter to divinely established ordinances, which your own common sense should have first led you to regard before attempting to worship. Plenty of fresh air, and proper temperature, and good bodily condition, would probably have secured for you all a blessed meeting. Hereafter, then, comply first with these requisite bodily conditions, and then ask and expect, and receive also, the presence and power of the Holy Ghost.

5. We mentioned as a *fifth* class of human conditions of a good Prayer Meeting *the executive.* By this we mean everything relating to the *conducting* or *leading* of the meeting. A meeting to be good, must have a good leader, must be well managed or run. It must aim at some definite spiritual result, and must accomplish that result. The leader must be beforehand appointed; he must be promptly on hand at the appointed time; he must come well prepared; Scripture and hymns all carefully selected, and adapted to each other, so as to give unity of spirit to the service; his remarks must be brief, spirited, scriptural, to the point; the prayers and remarks made by other brethren should be relevant to the subject and spirit of the meeting given it by the leader; the leader should keep the meeting, from the beginning to the end, under his own control and direction; he should rarely if ever throw it open indiscriminately for voluntary remarks, hymns and prayers; for generally, if such an opportunity is given, those who are least competent to lead profitably are the first to avail themselves of the opportunity, and often entirely destroy the good frame or spirit of the meeting by the introduction of something utterly crude, irrelevant, and even nonsensical. He will also, as a good leader, *make much in the meeting of God's word.* He will avoid all mere jingling rhymes and unmeaning choruses, and will, as much as possible, make use of the old and precious hymns of the Church, hymns full of the very essence and marrow of the Gospel, and in which God's saints have, for centuries, wafted their praise in song to heaven. And then he will, no matter how interesting the services may be, not protract them too long, but, before the

interest subsides, close the worship, and dismiss the people to their homes. Good leadership is, then, another important and very essential human condition of a good Prayer Meeting.

6. But, *the co-operative* is still another human condition of a good Prayer-Meeting. By this we mean that a really encouraging condition of a good congregational Prayer Meeting demands that all the members of the congregation should if possible attend it, and should do all that they properly can to make it encouraging and good. The members of a church should esteem the Prayer Meeting an important service. They should bring their children, and servants, and friends, with them to it. They should all be provided with hymn-books, and join heartily in singing. They should silently and intelligently join in the prayers as they are offered by those who lead. They should, if capable, and called upon, themselves lead in prayer. They should by their respectful attention, and reverent attitude, encourage those who lead, and show to all around them that they are conscious that they are in God's house, and love and appreciate His worship. And then, when they leave the meeting, they should seek to carry its salutary lessons and influences with them to their homes, and exhibit and practice them in their lives, and thus by the very sweetness and godliness of their spirit and conduct, caught like that of Moses by communion with God in the Mount, recommend the worship of God, and allure all around them to join with them in it.

ARTICLE IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER AS HELD BY THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

*Translated from the German of Rev. Dr. v. BURGER of Munich, by Rev. G. F. BEHRINGER, Mendon, Ill.

It must first of all be remembered, that the Lutheran Church draws its faith exclusively from the words, and bases its doctrine solely upon the act (celebration), in and by which Christ the Lord instituted the Holy Supper. The Church honors the Lord's Supper as a Sacrament. Yet she does not infer from her conception of what a sacrament is, that which is given us in the Lord's Supper; but conversely, she deduces the limitations of the sacramental conception from that which is bestowed upon us in Holy Baptism and in the Holy Supper. So likewise does she well know what her dogmatic theologians term the *unio mystica*, the personal union of the believer with the Lord, the communion with Him by faith, through which the word is fulfilled: "Ye in me, and I in you," (John 14 : 20; 15 : 4). But the Church does not find this personal communion by faith, which is elsewhere attested, to be declared in or founded upon the Lord's Supper; but rather does she find therein a peculiar gift, presented only in this ordinance, concerning whose nature and essence information is to be derived from no other source than from the institution of Christ Himself, from the words which He spake thereby, from the celebration which He performed to that end, and which He commanded His disciples to continue to

---

*Herzog's Real Encyclopædia, Vol. 28—38, (2d Edition).

NOTE.—The article in Herzog on the Lord's Supper consists of three parts—the Lutheran view, by Rev. Dr. v. Burger, Münich; the Reformed view, by Rev. Prof. J. J. Herzog, D. D., Erlangen; The Ceremonial Rites, etc., by Rev. Dr. E. Stähelin, Basel. It is proposed to furnish translations of these in three successive numbers of the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, and it is believed they will be of more than ordinary interest and value to our readers.—ED.

repeat. Therefore the Lutheran Church regards as inadmissible, the citing of the declarations of Jesus, in John 6 : 35 *et seq.*, to serve as an explanation of that which the Holy Supper vouchsafes unto us. For if it be not denied that the Lord, at the time of this conversation in Capernaum, already knew and had determined what He would do on the last evening before His suffering; and even if it be granted, that He did not choose the declaration, in John 6 : 53—56, without some reference to the ordinance later to be instituted; nevertheless it is certain, from the occasion and connection of that testimony, as well as from its contents, that Christ did not in that passage speak of the Holy Supper, and could not so have spoken, inasmuch as He desired to say something comprehensible, if not by the understanding, at least by the faith (of the disciples). Therefore a detailed examination of John 6, for the purpose of verifying the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, is superfluous, for even the Confessions entirely omit its consideration, and quote the passage John 6 : 54 *et seq.*, but a single time in *Formula Concordiæ*, *Sol. decl.* 7 : 61, in order to attest, that the Lord there speaks of spiritual communion by faith, and not of the sacramental communion in the Holy Supper.

But whilst the Lutheran Church bases its faith and its doctrine of the Lord's Supper upon the institution of the sacrament as recorded in the Holy Scriptures, she firmly maintains that the words of the institution are not to be taken in a figurative or tropical sense, but simply as they read, according to their own real meaning, just as their literal understanding presents itself, (Form. Conc., Epitome VII., 7). We are to consider then, first of all, the record of the appointment of this ordinance. This has been handed down to us in a fourfold version: Matt. 26 : 26—28; Mark 14 : 22—24; Luke 22 : 19, 20; and 1 Cor. 11 : 23—25. These reports, because of agreement and connection, may be put in pairs: Matthew and Mark on the one hand, Luke and Paul on the other. That the difference between them does not affect the meaning of the recorded facts will appear further on. We shall proceed from the record of St. Paul, and moreover

for this reason: because he refers as the source of his information concerning the Holy Supper directly to the Lord Himself. That Paul should say, in 1 Cor. 11 : 25, *ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου*, and not *Ἐγὼ παρέλαβον παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου*, is of no material consequence. For even if it can not be inferred from the words of Paul that he had received his information immediately from the mouth of the Master, or by way of a special revelation from the Lord, they nevertheless express the complete certainty of the apostle, that what he says, and the manner in which he says it, even if he had indirectly received it, originated with the Lord; that he is conscious of having the Lord as author and guarantee of that which he declares. That Luke's report connects with Paul's is explained from the relation in which he stood to Paul, whom he accompanied on his last journey to Jerusalem (Acts 20 : 5; 21 : 17), and with whom he remained in his first and second imprisonments (Acts 27 : 2; 28 : 16; Col. 4 : 14; Philemon 24; 2 Tim. 4 : 11).

Paul and Luke report that the Lord, on the last evening previous to His suffering, at the conclusion or after the close of the Paschal Supper which he had celebrated with his disciples, took bread, gave thanks, or uttered a prayer of thanksgiving, brake it and gave it to the disciples assembled about Him with these words: "This is my body* for you," (Luke: "Which is given for you"): "This do in remembrance of me." That the shorter version, "this is my body for you," affords the same meaning as the longer one by Luke, "which is given for you," needs no further affirmation. For by the adjunct with the definite article: *τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, the body of Christ is designated as the gift appointed for them and to be imparted to them. The body of Christ becomes the object or medium of communication to them through this that it is "given" for them, *i. e.*,—just as the parallel passage of the blood shows, to which Matthew, Mark, and Luke have the addition, "which is shed for you"—that

*κλώμενον="broken," is omitted in the Sinaitic Codex, and decided by Meyer to be spurious.

for them He is delivered unto death. Paul continues: "After the same manner also the cup" (supplement "he took" from v. 23) "when he had supped, saying, This is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink, in remembrance of me." Luke adds thereto: "Which is shed for you," (*τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη εν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι μου, τὸ ὑπερ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον,* where the nominative *τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον,* either because of the irregularity of the connection with *αἵματι,* is to be understood as in Luke 20 : 27, or is to be connected with *τὸ ποτήριον*). Here this question above all others presents itself: how the words, "this cup is the new testament in my blood," *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι,* are to be grammatically connected; whether the adjunct clause wanting the article, *ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι,* is to be connected with *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, i. e.* the new testament established in or through my blood; or whether it is to be referred back to *τὸ ποτήριον, i. e.* this cup is in or through my blood the new testament (covenant).

But this question can not properly be raised with the passage 1 Cor. 11 : 25, where, because of the position of *ἐστίν* between *διαθηκή* and *ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι,* the union of the latter with *διαθήκη* is excluded. But even according to the reading in Luke, who omits *ἐστίν,* and simply writes: *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθηκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μοῦ* the connection of *αἵματί* with *διαθήκη* appears to be inadmissible. For *η καινη διαθηκη* is a conception entirely finished and complete within itself, that neither needs nor demands a determining adjunct clause of manner or direction of any kind whatsoever, so that it might have been added without any article; as in Eph. 1 : 15: *την πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ;* or Rom. 3 : 25: *δια πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι;* or 2 Cor. 7 : 7: *τὸν ὑμῶν ζηλον ὑπὲρ ἐμου,* etc. Rather must the words *ἐν τῷ αἵματι* be connected with the entire sentence; and thus they signify how, or for what reason, it can be said of the cup that it is the new testament (covenant). This it is in so far and because what the Lord presents therewith is His blood shed for us; this it is in, or through, or by virtue of, the blood of Christ, which by Him is given in the cup.

Furthermore, it is to be remembered, that the words "after the supper," *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι,* in Luke and with Paul, declare, that the cup was given *after* the close of the Paschal Supper; that it was therefore a new institution, which neither belonged to the Paschal Supper itself, nor formed a constituent part of its celebration. Whether it must therefore be inferred, that in point of time, the giving of the cup was separate from the bread, or whether the *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι* is mentioned with the cup only as a supplement, which is likewise to be applied to the giving of the bread, may remain an open question. That both, the distribution of the bread and of the wine, belong together and form a connected celebration, remains intact, and is furthermore confirmed by their being united in the accounts of Paul and Luke, as well as in those of Matthew and Mark.

Finally, the words, "this do in remembrance of me," do not express the object of the institution which the disciples are commanded to commemorate, as if it meant: "this do in order that you may remember me;" but rather do they express the meaning of the institution (ordinance.) It is a memorial celebration of the death of Jesus, which they commemorate who administer the Lord's Supper, just as Paul, in the 26 v. (1 Cor. 11) immediately adds: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." *Καταγγέλλετε* is not in the Imperative but in the Indicative Present, and expresses not what they *should* do, but what they *are* doing in that they celebrate the Holy Supper. Concerning the purport of the Lord's Supper, concerning that which is therein given and received, these words (*i. e.* the accounts of Luke and Paul) say nothing whatever; but simply designate the nature and purpose of the celebration of the ordinance as conducted in and by the Church.

If now we turn to the records of Matthew and Mark, we shall have but little to add. Both report the words at the presentation of the bread with equal brevity. Matthew:

"Take, eat; this is my body;" Mark: "Take,* this is my body." And with the cup, Matthew: "Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, (testament) which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Mark prefaces this with: "and they all drank of it," and then continues: "And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant (testament), which is shed for many." Peculiar to Matthew is the addition: "which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matthew and Mark both delare that *all* those present drank of the cup; Matthew mentions it as a fact, Luke as a command of the Lord. Both term it, "blood of the covenant," and thereby connect with the accounts of Luke and Paul, in which the cup, by virtue of the blood of Christ, is called the "the new testament" (covenant). All four witnesses testify to this: that through the blood of Christ a new covenant is established, whether the word "new" itself is expressed, as by Luke and Paul, or omitted, as by Matthew and Mark. For truly, it can not be the old covenant, long since fulfilled, for whose institution the blood of Christ was shed. The words refer to Exodus 24: 6: "Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord has made with you concerning all these words." That which was wrought out by Christ, in the shedding of His blood, forms the completing and concluding parallel to that which occurred in the establishment of God's covenant with the people of Israel. For what He institutes is the new covenant which can never grow old (Heb. 8: 6; 9: 18–23). Of the blood of the Lord it is said, that it is "shed for many," not as if thereby were meant, "not for *all*;" but the term, "for many," is used as in (Matt. 20: 28) and likewise, though with the article, *δί πολλοί,* in Rom. 5: 15, 19, in order to indicate that the number is great of those who should be benefited by this shedding of blood.

At this point arises the decisive question, whether the words: "this is my body, this is my blood," are to be taken literally (*i. e.* in their native sense), so that what is presented

*The Author follows the reading of the Sinaitic Codex.

is really the body and blood of the Lord; or symbolically, figuratively, so that it is the image or sign of the body and blood of Christ not given with the sign itself, but in some way or other mentally connected therewith. No emphasis can be laid upon the copula "is;" Luke omits it with the cup, without changing the meaning. The question at issue is the equalization of subject and predicate. But other passages are quoted where this equalizing takes place without doing away with the figurative meaning of subject or of predicate, as in Matt. 13:38, 39, or in John 15:1, 5. Yet it is evident that such passages are not to be quoted as an explanation of the words of institution. For it is certainly something different when the Lord teaches and instructs in figures and parables from that where He in a solemn hour establishes an institution by means of a presented gift, and denominates that which He bestows and presents. The question at issue is not to teach or explain a matter by the use of an illustrative picture or simile, but to designate that which the disciples are to take from His hand, to eat and to drink. To have the Lord speak in image and simile conflicts with the seriousness of the time (occasion), the meaning of the institution, and is incompatible with the brief and precise manner of expression of the words; the more so, since the added phrase, "given for you," "shed for you," will permit us to think only of the real body and blood. And the substitution of the thought: "this is a figure (symbol) of the body which is given for you" would, as it were, empty the ordinance of its meaning and render it nugatory, so that it would no longer harmonize with the lofty words used; moreover, the words (if thus used), could not have been more intelligible to the disciples than if understood by them in their real sense. Enigmatical and mysterious they were to them without doubt. But the disciples were accustomed to hear such words from His mouth. Their faith was not shaken thereby, but rather deepened and strengthened by the charm of their increasing experience of His might as well as of His truth. With good reason does the Form. Conc., (Sol. decl. 44, 45), call attention to this fact:

how inappropriate it would be to have the Lord speak in a flowery, figurative manner, in the institution of so important an ordinance, which is to be observed by all christendom so long as it awaits the reappearing of the Lord. The words as they stand do not afford the least occasion for such an interpretation, which can but be carried into them from motives and considerations elsewhere found, with which however the true explanation has nothing in common, and which are to be considered hereafter. As the outcome of an interpretation based upon these words as they read, the following only can avail: with *τοῦτο*, which the giver utters, he designates that which he bestows. This gift he terms His body and His blood. Paul and Luke likewise agree with this, for they also declare, that the cup which they are to drink assures unto them His blood. The institution which the Lord establishes and whose significance His words express, He commands His disciples to repeat. They are to do as He has done in their presence, in remembrance of Him. Now it is certain and indeed it is declared, that it was bread and a cup filled with wine, which the Lord took and gave, and of which it is said that it is His body and blood. Hence the question arises, whether, according to these words, bread and wine have ceased to be such, and according to their substance have become something else, viz. the body and blood of Christ. These words do not compel the acceptance of such an interpretation, and even Paul did not so understand them. For he writes in 1 Cor. 10, 16: *τὸ ποτηριον της εὐλογίας ὅ, εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστιν του αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τον ἄρτον, ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἕν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν· οἱ γαρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτοῦ μετέχομεν.* This passage contains the most important and significant explanation concerning the mystery of the Lord's Supper which the New Testament affords. "The cup of blessing which we bless" is the sacramental cup. It is called so for the reason that the Lord blessed it when He instituted the memorial supper; *εὐλογήσας* is exchangeable with *εὐχαριστήσας* (Matt. 26: 26, 27; and Mark 14 : 22, 23). From the adjunct clause,

"which we bless," it appears, that the Apostle means the sacramental celebration as it is commemorated in the Church on the ground of Christ's institution. Of this cup he says, it is "the communion of the blood of Christ," and so afterward of the bread "which we break," *i. e.* of the sacramental celebration observed by the Church, that it is "the communion of the body of Christ." Therewith these three particulars are clearly set forth: 1. That bread and wine are not changed into any other substance; for it reads cup and bread in the 16th as well as in the 17th verse, (compare 1 Cor. 9 : 26–28). 2. That this bread and this cup is communion (not *the* communion, since the article is wanting in the original; therefore not the only existing or the only possible communion, but a real communion) of the body and blood of Christ; that this communion is bestowed with the bread and wine, and indissolubly connected with their reception. 3. That the means whereby we become possessed of this communion is the partaking of the bread and wine; so that whoever receives and partakes of the bread and the wine, enters into and possesses the communion of the body and blood of Christ, whether he have or have not comprehended it as a mental conception. For this is the pith or turning point of the entire passage, (I Cor. 10 : 14–21), that the Apostle admonishes the Corinthians, who were rather inclined to boast of their high-toned liberalism and of a freedom from narrow prejudices, that it in no wise depends upon their opinions or conceptions, when they participate in feasts to idols, whether they thereby enter into fellowship (communion) with the idols. For this communion is connected with the thing itself with which they enter into relation, regardless of what they may think thereof. He verifies this statement, in the first place, by referring to the real, objectively present communion, existing independently of the thoughts and opinions of the participants, which the communicants receive with the consecrated elements, with the body and blood of the Lord; just as he afterwards proves in the 17th verse, that, none the less, the partaking of the *one* bread, unites the communicants with each other into one body. For the words, ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, con-

stitute the antecedent proposition, ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν the consequent, as the following sentence shows: ὁ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ του ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. There is one bread; therefore are we the many, although we are many, one body; this we are because the bread is one, of which we all receive our part. But the bread which possesses this unifying power is that which is designated in the 16th verse; viz: that bread which is the communion of the body of Christ for all that partake of it. Therefore the bond of union of the communicants with each other is the equal participation of all in the bread, in and with which the Lord communicates to them His body.

From this passage of the Apostle, in connection with the words of institution of Christ, the Lutheran Church draws the conclusion, that the earthly elements, bread and wine, are not transformed, but remain what they are, and rejects the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. On the other hand, the Church teaches, that with the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are united in a mysterious, supernatural manner; so that, he who partakes of the former receives therewith the latter. Luther, therefore, and others after him, explain the τοῦτο of the words of institution in a synecdochical manner, *i. e.* it declares: the bread which I give unto you embraces within itself the body; and in a similar manner the cup. Yet the truth at issue does not depend upon the assumption of a synecdoche in the words of institution, nor upon the grammatical interpretation of the terms employed, but upon the very fact that in the Holy Supper, the body and blood of Christ are truly present, given, and received. And the connection between the heavenly and the earthly element is best termed *unio sacramentalis*, because it is a union unlike any other outside of this sacrament, and remains altogether confined to it. Therefore, it may furthermore be inferred, that where the communion is not held, this unión does not take place; *i. e.* the body and blood of Christ are not present in the bread and wine, when these are not taken, eaten, and drunken according to the Lord's instructions. Therewith everything disappears that might be called, with a semblance of reason, ἀρτολατρεία (bread-worship);

for the consecrated bread, with which the body of the Lord is united, is not an object of adoration, but of partaking (reception) and appointed only for this. It is superstition to regard either the crumbs that may fall, or the drops that may be spilled, as anything or part of the body and blood of Christ. To guard against all such anxiety, and against all abuse that either is or may be practiced with the consecrated elements, the rule has been set up: Nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra usum a Christo institutum, ("nothing has the character of a sacrament beyond the use instituted by Christ.") Therewith is connected the question, whence this wonderful gift in the Holy Supper proceeds, or how the mysterious union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine is accomplished. The answer thereto is: entirely through the continued working of the power of the original institution of Christ, (Form. Conc , Sol. decl., VII., 75). This original institution, and the instructions connected therewith to continue its celebration as the Lord observed it in the first place, to do (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε) that which He did, this has the power of a creative word of command, which becomes just as energetic, as often as occurs what the Lord has ordered, as the command in Gen. 1:11, which in every springtime decks anew the fields with fresh verdure. This statement is insisted upon over against the opinion, that the words of consecration in the mouth of the priest worked the presence of the body and the blood of Christ, (Form. Conc., Sol. decl., VII., 74). Not indeed these, but "the power of Almighty God, and the word, institution, and command of our Lord Jesus Christ accomplish" it. Nevertheless, at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the words of the institution are not to be omitted, but to be spoken or sung, clearly and plainly, before the congregation: 1, because in obedience to the command of Christ, who declares: "this do;" therefore He wills that every successive Communion shall be a repetition of the first. 2. In order to awaken, strengthen, and assure the faith of the hearer concerning the being, nature, and benefit of the sacrament. And, 3, to dedicate and consecrate the elements of bread and wine unto an holy use, wherefore Paul terms the

cup, "the cup of blessing which we bless," (Form. Conc., Sol. decl. VII., 79—82).

Another question, concerning the exact time in which the mysterious union of the heavenly gifts with the visible signs takes place, is regarded as idle and impertinent. The Lord established the ordinance of the Holy Supper as an entirety, and His institution of it is observed only then when the *whole* of it is observed. Therefore its blessing and its power are conditioned upon this: that its administration be carried out in all its parts. But these are three: the consecration, the distribution, and the reception (consecratio, distributio, et sumtio). A consecration not followed by both the other parts, would be ineffectual, in fact none at all. The believing certainty that we receive in the Holy Supper what the Lord intended that we should, is not attached to a single part of the united administration, but to the entirety of the celebration as Christ established it, (Form. Conc. Sol. decl. VII. 83–87).

In the Lutheran Confessions the fact is emphasized, that the gift in the Holy Supper, the body and blood of Christ, is received by the communicants with the mouth (manducatio oralis); and that this gift is received by *all* the communicants, though with diverse effects (manducatio indignorum).

Stress is laid upon the oral partaking, in opposition to the teaching of Calvin, who held that the communicant in receiving the bread and the wine is placed by the Holy Spirit through faith, into such communion with the Lord exalted to the right hand of God, that he really experiences the power and the energy proceeding from the glorified body of Christ, and hence is truly fed and refreshed with the body and blood of the Lord; yet not by means of an oral reception of the heavenly gift, but spiritually by faith. This conception the Lutheran Church does not find in harmony with the words of Christ's institution. For in the same the Lord ordained no other means of receiving His gifts than this: take, eat, drink. If anything else had been necessary for the reception of what He bestows, He would have declared it. But since He has prescribed this, that in the Holy Supper we should take, eat and drink the appointed gift—which the

first disciples did, and which could not have taken place, and indeed cannot take place, in any other way—hence we must maintain, that he who receives the consecrated bread and wine in the Holy Communion, receives and partakes of that which the Lord bestows under these signs, and which He presents according to His own words, viz.: the body and the blood of the Lord.

Therefore Paul calls the cup which we bless and the bread which we break, the communion of the body and blood of Christ. Both of these are received orally and partaken of in and by means of the bread and wine, and not by any act of faith or of the Holy Spirit differing from or separately accompanying this oral reception. When, therefore, the Lutheran Confessions make use of the term, that the body and blood of the Lord are received in the Holy Supper, "in, with, and under" the bread and the wine, this has no other meaning than that no one can partake of the bread and the wine in this sacrament, without at the same time receiving, by orally partaking of these gifts, that which the Lord has ordained and promised to bestow, His body and His blood. But in no wise is it to be understood as if the body and the blood of the Lord were *locally* included in the bread and wine (impranatio); or as if bound to them in such a manner that they (the body and the blood) were swallowed and digested like earthly food. In opposition to this Capernaitic understanding of the reception of the body and the blood of Christ, the Lutheran Church moreover maintains the *spiritual* reception of the heavenly elements. And yet not as if this spiritual reception separately accompanied the oral partaking, and were something different and distinct from the same. But in so far as the manner of the union of the body and the blood of the Lord with the bread and wine is a sacramental, spiritual and heavenly union; and that, therefore, what is united with the earthly elements in a spiritual and supernatural manner, can be imparted to the communicant in no other than a spiritual, miraculous way—which however can take place only when he receives it orally as the Lord ordained that it should be partaken of, by eating and drinking,

(Form. Conc., Sol. decl. 104–105). Nothing further then is to be understood from this doctrine—in maintaining the *manducatio oralis*, *i. e.* that the gifts (blessings) of the Holy Supper are orally received—than the faithful, immoveable adherence to the words with which the Lord established the sacrament, and the conscientious fear of a trifling interpretation, or of a disguising exegesis, by adding to or taking away from the words of the institution.

Therewith the following is most intimately connected: that the blessings of the Holy Communion, the body and the blood of the Lord, are received by all who celebrate this ordinance, irrespective of their subjective (personal) condition. For if neither our belief nor our unbelief, whether of the giver (the officiating minister) or of the receiver (the communicant), but alone the instituting word of the Lord, locates and causes to be present in the Holy Supper the body and blood of the Lord, then He bestows the same upon all who observe the Holy Communion according to His appointment. And if He has ordained no other means of reception, than the eating and drinking of the consecrated gifts, it follows of necessity, that every one partaking of these gifts, after the manner of the divine appointment, receives also what the Lord presents therewith. If indeed he partakes unworthily, he receives the same not as a blessing, but as unto judgment (condemnation), 1 Cor. 11 : 29. Yet that such an one does not receive mere bread and wine, but, with the same, the body and the blood of the Lord, the words of St. Paul show, in 1 Cor. 11 : 27 : "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord"—*i. e.* he commits sin against the body and the blood of Christ, which he has received unworthily. And the same meaning is drawn from the utterance of St. Paul, in v. 29: "for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation unto himself, not discerning the Lord's body"—when he partakes of the earthly elements without remembering that he receives the body and the blood of the Lord therewith. Such unworthy partaking could not be sinning against the body and the blood of the

Lord, if the unworthy communicant were receiving bread and wine, were he not partaking, at the same time, of the body and the blood of the Lord. For in such a case he would be sinning simply against the consecrated elements, or against the Lord who appointed them, but not against the the gifts themselves, which for him would not be present (in the Holy Supper).

The declaration that the unworthy communicant also receives the body and the blood of the Lord, is, therefore, a simple consequence, and yet a necessary consequence, of the construction of the words of the institution in their original meaning as they read; and this result unavoidably presents itself, when that which the institution teaches is maintained, viz: 1, that in the Holy Communion the body and the blood of the Lord are truly united with the bread and the wine, by means of which the Lord presents both, even in a wonderful and incomprehensible manner; and, 2, that the Lord has appointed no other means of reception than the eating and drinking of His gifts. Moreover, the Confession* distinctly declares who are to be regarded as worthy or as unworthy communicants. Unworthy communicants are only such as do not believe, (Form. Conc. Epit. 18; Sol. decl. VII, 68–71), who are without sorrow and contrition over their sins,and who come to the sacrament without true faith and without good resolution to better their life. On the other hand, true worthiness does not consist in a greater or less degree of strength or weakness of faith, but in the merits of Christ which the weak may appropriate, as well as he who has a strong and happy faith. The merits of Christ will make him worthy who will embrace the same, whether with fear and trembling, or with joyful assurance. For the Lord has called the weary and heavy-laden unto Himself; He is the physician of the sick and not of the strong. And yet the strongest faith is

*By the term "the Confession," (Das Bekenntniss), our author means the Formula of Concord.

coupled with the deepest feeling of personal sin and unworthiness.

Concerning the blessing of the Holy Communion, or concerning that which it profits, the Confession speaks briefly: "that is pointed out in these words, 'given and shed for you for the remission of sins,' which words show us, that forgiveness of sin, life and salvation, are imparted to us in the sacrament; for where there is remission of sins, there is also life and salvation."

With this exposition of that which the Lutheran Church teaches and confesses concerning the Lord's Supper, we have reached the conclusion of the matter. The leading points and essential parts of the confession have been developed in the foregoing. They may be summed up in these three propositions:

1. The words of the institution are to be taken as they read, neither figuratively nor symbolically, neither as a simile nor an allegory, but according to the native (original) meaning of the words; and since the Lord Himself has said: "Take, eat, drink, this is my body, my blood," therefore His body and His blood are really and truly present in the Holy Supper, and are therein distributed and received.

2. This reception takes place orally, according to the institution, because in this sacrament the Lord has appointed no other way of reception; and yet spiritually, in so far as Christ's body and blood is a spiritual, heavenly food, which does not enter into, and is not assimilated by, the body, after the manner of earthly nourishment.

3. Because the reception of Christ's body and blood is attached to earthly signs (media), both are received by all those who partake of the sacrament administered according to the manner of its institution, irrespective of their worthiness or unworthiness; yet by the believers as a blessing, by the unbelievers as unto judgment (condemnation).

Yet we cannot omit the consideration of several questions, which force themselves upon us, in reference to the Holy Supper, and which moreover have become not only subjects

for theological discussion, but are also referred to in the Confession of the Church.

In the first place it may be asked, why does the Lord give His body and His blood separate in the Holy Supper? And is not the Roman Catholic Church right, when she offers to the communicant only the bread and therewith the body, inasmuch as the blood is, self-evidently, included in the body? In reply to this it may reasonably be said, that such a procedure implies a willful and therefore inadmissible correction of the words and institution of Christ. With what intent and purpose, however, is it declared, in presenting the cup: "Drink ye ALL of it;" and Mark testifies that it was thus offered and received. Now if there had been no purpose, no special meaning in this, the Lord would not so have ordered it. If we change or willfully trifle with the words of institution, we put ourselves in conflict with the obedience which we owe to the words of Christ, as well as with the faith uniquely and surely grounded upon these words. What indeed would remain to us as certain, were we to presume to subject even the words of Christ to our criticism, and according to our own notions to modify their import! For the believing Christian it is sufficient to know: thus hath the Lord spoken and thus hath He ordained?

If however the subject-matter itself be more closely examined, it would lead to the consideration of the peculiar character of the sacrament. In the introductory part of this article mention was made of a communion of the believer with Christ, established by faith and realized through the Holy Spirit, which is not connected (bound up) with the Holy Communion. This is the *personal* union which exists between Him and His own, of whom the Lord speaks in John 17: 22–23: And the glory which Thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are one: I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and has loved them as Thou hast loved Me." (Compare John 15: 4–6). To this belongs also the testimony of Christ in Capernaum: John 6. But the special gift which the Lord

vouchsafes unto us in the Holy Supper is this, that He makes us partakers of His corporeality (Leiblichkeit), so that the Christian's natural being should secure part of and communion with the Divine-human nature of the Mediator and Redeemer. And just because it is an imparting of the corporeality of the Lord, which this sacrament vouchsafes unto us, is this corporeality given in its essential, constituent parts. Human nature from its bodily side is called flesh and blood: flesh, according to its outer, visible structure; blood, according to its inner, nourishing, preserving, and continually renewing structure. As true man indeed, the Lord also assumed flesh and blood (Heb. 2 : 14; John 6 : 51–56). And since He wishes to make us partakers of His corporeality, He gives us His body and His blood, as the essential parts of His human corporeality, but does not say: His FLESH and His blood—because FLESH is the designaton of this corporeality in its temporary, earthy structure, whereas BODY and blood is enduring, so sure as the Lord arose bodily from the dead, ascended bodily into the heavens, and has been bodily glorified.

There are other statements, as for example this: that the Lord instituted the Holy Supper as the Paschal Feast of the new covenant, and that He therefore caused it to resemble that of the old covenant—in which the flesh and the blood each had its special application and appointment—do not apply to the subject under consideration, for the reason that *there* the blood was poured out (or away), whereas *here* it is partaken of. But if another statement may be added concerning the specific meaning of the Lord's Supper, it would be this: that even the body of the Christian is not created merely for temporal use (earthly life), but rather destined for future glorification, and that the imparting of the corporeality of the glorified Mediator, is indeed a pledge of this our future glorification, and is moreover a preparatory foundation for the same. To expatiate further upon this point is not here in place. The intimation given will suffice to call attention to the fact, that, in regarding the object and purpose of the Holy Supper, the Lutheran view involves princi-

ples of universal and profound signification. In connection compare the passage, Eph. 5 : 30, according to the received and sufficiently authenticated version.

Connected with this is a second consideration. We have spoken of the imparted corporeality of the glorified Mediator. Therewith is implied that the body and the blood of the Lord, of which we partake in the Holy Supper, is the glorified corporeality of the Lord. Over against this, the objection can not be reasonably maintained, that the Lord is speaking of the body which is given for us, and of the blood which is shed for us, and that this was not the glorified, but the mortal body, subject unto death. For the body of our Lord at the right hand of God, is none other than the one He assumed in His state of lowliness. It is *now* differently *constituted*, and yet it is the same body which He took with Him out of the grave, and which He has translated with Himself into an heavenly existence. It is therefore inadmissible to say of the glorified body of Christ, that it is not the same as that body which for us was given unto death. The change of its state does not destroy the sameness of the body. Another inference to be rejected is this: if it be the glorified body of the Christ of which we partake in the Holy Supper, then indeed the disciples could not as yet have received the same when the Lord instituted this sacrament, for then and there He was in their midst as the incarnated, but not yet as the glorified One. In and for itself it would do away with all truth and all reality of the institution of the sacrament as appointed by the Lord, could it be said that its first celebration by the Lord, in the circle of His disciples, and with them, had been merely a *typical* celebration. For if the Lord did not, at the time when He himself said: "Take, eat, this is My body; drink, this is My blood," really bestow what He said, what assurance have we, that, in repeating the celebration of the ordinance as established by Him, we shall receive that which He could not have given, as alleged, at the first celebration? The disciples, then and there, as surely received that which the Lord, in distributing to them,

calls His gifts, as Christendom, since then, has been receiving the same as often as Christ's ordinance has been administered. The Lord, who has power to lay down His life and power to take it again (John 10 : 18), whose might is neither confined to nor limited by the laws of our human nature, which might He exercised over His corporeality whilst yet in the flesh (*e. g.* John 6 : 19—21), He indeed could also impart what He said at the institution of the Holy Supper; for He is neither contained by, nor confined by the limits of, His body, but rather enjoys the freest disposal of it, to do with it or to use it as He will. Wonderful is this free power of Christ's disposition of His corporeality, mysterious and supernatural, it is true, but not impossible to Him, who in His own person is the wonder of all wonders, whom the prophet designates, above all other names, Wonderful (Isaiah 9 : 6).

This leads us, of necessity, to a brief consideration of the last point. The Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper has been severely attacked and controverted with the assertion, that it contradicts the very nature and essence of corporeality. Also that the almighty power of God can not be adduced to its support; for His power does not show itself in doing the very opposite to that which He has determined upon doing. Herein is included the unchangeable, local circumscription of the body of Christ. For God has determined not to destroy that which He has once assumed. But this would take place, could He (Christ) be, either before or after His glorification, at several places, with the substance of His body. The exalted Christ is at the right hand of God; therefore he can not be bodily present in the Holy Supper.

Against this objection it would not suffice to refer to the state of glorification in which Christ exists. For His glorication does not destroy the nature of His corporeality as such. And no one would maintain, that, for example, the glorified children of God could, by virtue of their glorification, exist everywhere, or at least in many places, at the same time. And, indeed, the Lutheran Confession does not say anything of the kind. Christ possesses the freest disposal of His corporeality, as

ascribed to Him in the institution of the Holy Supper, and in its continued celebration, not because of His glorification, but by virtue of the union of the human nature with the divine, in His divine-human personality. Yet from this connection of the divine and the human nature in the unity of His person, the commingling of both must not be inferred; but rather a mutual communication of their respective powers and attributes (communicatio idiomatum). They are not so united that each might manifest itself apart from the other, but that where Christ is, and where He has promised to be, there He is entire according to both natures, not commingled and not separated. By virture of this wonderful and unique assumption of our human nature into communion with the divine in Christ, not comprehensible by any human comparison, the local circumscription of corporeality is not applicable to the body of Christ. He has the capacity of being present where He will in more than one way, not only locally, according to which He would always be confined to a distinct place and could not be present at any other at the same time; but rather, as all things are present to Him always and everywhere, so He is likewise present whenever and wherever He has promised to be; and no local limitations can hinder Him from realizing His presence even bodily in the Holy Supper after He has promised so to do. This is the so-called ubiquity of the body of Christ; not a local extension of His body over the entire universe,—a monstrous thought, which would indeed destroy all corporeality,—but the ability, arising from and because of the union with the divine nature, to evince Himself bodily wherever He will; and this He has promised to do in the Holy Supper. Therefore, the possibility of this presence does not rest upon the glorification of Christ, but upon the union and mutual communication and permeation of the divine and the human natures in the unity of His personality. Thus briefly does Luther, and the Church which is called after him, justify its declarations concerning the Lord's Supper, as found in its Confession. And here again it is manifest, that in the Lutheran

doctrine of the Holy Supper, issues of far-reaching significance present themselves, that culminate in the question: was the human nature in Christ capable of such a permeation by the Divine nature, as is maintained in the declaration of the corporeal, not local, yet real presence of the body and the blood of Christ in the Holy Supper? Or, in other words, was a real, and hence an operative union of both natures effected in Christ? It is evident what influence the answer to this question must have upon Christ's entire work of redemption. And one would need first to inquire, whether there be any reason for accusing Luther of mere obstinacy and dogmatism, because in his disputation with Zwingli at Marburg, and afterwards until the end of his life, he never wavered from nor yielded the truth, that Christ's body and blood are really and truly present in the Holy Supper, although in a mysterious and supernatural manner, and that they are distributed (imparted) and received.

For the literature upon this doctrine, besides the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, see: "*Frank, Theologie der Concordienformel*, Part III.; *v. Hofman, Schriftbeweiss* II., 2, p. 223, *et seq.*

[The Reformed Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, by Rev. Prof. J. J. Herzog, Erlangen, will appear in the April number of the QUARTERLY.]

ARTICLE V.

THOUGHT THE GREAT REALITY.

By Prof. W. H. Wynn, Ph. D., State Agricultural College, Ames, Ia.

As Physiological Psychology has come to be a recognized branch of philosophical research, the one absorbing question before it is: What traces are there of mental continuity between the brute and man? Physiologically the line of demarcation is by no means distinct,—so indistinct, indeed, that the leading scientists of the day have presumptively settled down in the doctrine, that whatever superiority man may have over the brute has fallen to him by the accidents of environment, and such other processes as are utterly inconsistent with original fixedness of type. Man is but the brute thrown forward by some species of evolution, which has dropped out or absorbed the intermediate links.

Of course behind and beyond all other postulates, with which biology essays to determine man's place in nature, is the new doctrine of species, or rather of *no species*, toward which the revelations of the microscope, and the startling discoveries of the physical sciences are setting with a tremendous bias; the doctrine that there is no scrutable, intelligent plan, no final cause, no predetermined type, discoverable in anything, and therefore no such specific distinction for man. Species is but the arbitrary limits which the naturalist assumes; and nowhere in all the wide domain of science is there anything like a divine conception, or self-conscious *Logos*, making deliberate records of its beneficence and wisdom, in such concrete types as matter and force may supply. Indeed we have it authoritatively announced, that the special mission of science is to drive away the teleological superstition from the field; to show that blind law has unchallenged

sway, where heretofore we had thought there was a beneficent plan.*

Then follows specious reasoning like this: If the theory of the *purposelessness* of nature is found to hold good, in all the wide range of forces underneath the mental organization of man, and in the more complex co-ordination of nerve-structure and brain function, of quite the entire mass of the animal kingdom, what forbids, nay how can we avoid, extending the generalization to the mind and brain of man? There is no predetermined type for anything, and therefore if man is now higher in the scale of being than the brute, it is not because the creative energy moved intelligently and deliberately to that end, but because, in the accidents of environment, and through the operation of blind law of natural selection, it turned out so to be.

To all which we may have no rigidly scientific reply, but against which we must precipitate certain strangely persistent and stubbornly irrepressible convictions, that will not consent to be thus over-ruled. These convictions are imbedded in the universal consciousness of the race. They issue from the mind, and are addressed to the mind. They are outside of all biological formulæ, and are no less assuring than they. They are the data of the self-conscious *ego*, and could by no possibility come round to us through a neurological route. Let us see if we cannot discover something in the nature of thought, as we are conscious of it—self-asserting, self-reflecting, human thought—which must interpose an impassable barrier between the brute and man, and be an irrefutable token of the intelligent order in accordance with which the universe was made.

INTROVERSION—ALTER EGO.

The power to think, with the all-pervading light of self-consciousness in the thought; to arrest any object of perception, as, for example, the pen I hold in my hand, and, at the

---

* See Address of Prof. Simon Newcomb before the St. Louis meeting of American Association for Advancement of Science, Aug., 1878.

same time, subject to my scrutiny the self-active intellect that sways the pen,—this double movement of the human mind is beyond all question the distinguishing glory of man. The dog thinks, no doubt, and often outstrips his master in cases where mere animal sagacity is to be brought into play; but the dog never thinks on his thought, and is not capable—to borrow a figure of Mr. Coleridge's subtle analysis—of making an irruption upon the flow of associated ideas. Mr. Coleridge defines thought to be "the laborious breaking through the law of association;" which is the same thing as to say, it is making a descent upon the unintermitting train of idea that is evermore spontaneously spinning through the mind. Any one may inspect this strange phenomenon for himself. In all unconstrained moments, something seems to do my thinking for me. I am a passive spectator to the scenes of a revolving panorama, which some unseen agency keeps in rapid transit before me; but, by and by, *I* rush upon the canvas, stop the motion of its wheels, and call the mute figures in living converse round the council-board I have set up in their midst.

Somewhere Mr. Carlyle, speaking in his characteristic way of the wondrous transformations that are thus wrought, by the intrusion of a strong, masterful, concentrated will upon the aimless, random, automatic, flow of ideas, and the new creation that springs up in consequence, describes it as the "thaumaturgic power of thought," meaning that it is a kind of constant miracle-working, this power the soul has, of rolling thought back on itself, and gathering in its straggling forces to a dignified parliament in the brain. *Thaumaturgus* it is, for, so far as we know, the self-active *ego* is the only miracle-worker that remains with us in the world. *I!* the pronoun itself is a perpetual refutation to every system of philosophy that would eliminate from human thinking the notion of cause, or in any way reduce it to the necessary sequence of nature's laws. When *I* have made my entrance on this dull round of involuntary thinking, the dumb show in an instant changes into a scene of animated bustle, the mute

shadows are turned into inspiration, and the dead puppets of the mind become the swift-winged children of the sun.

It will be seen, then, that self-consciousness, or the power of looking down upon our thought from a point, as it were, of easy poise above it, and rushing in upon it, as our own free energizing may direct—this is distinctively the high faculty in man which renders him akin to God. It is specifically the boundary line between the brute and human branches of the animal kindom, which never can be crossed by any "blue ape without a tail," however highly developed. Men are rightfully jealous of this crowning spiritual prerogative of human nature, and are instinctively repelled from the idea, that so lofty an endowment could have sprung up from the fortuitous survivals of mere natural selection. No! such a faculty did not wriggle up from the accidents of primitive jungles, but was designedly put in man by his Creator, as his own sign-manual to the crowning workmanship of his hand.

DOG AND APE APPROXIMATIONS.

Remarkable anatomical resemblances are found to exist between man and the apes, so much so, that the animal economy of the one may be set down as, in all essential particulars, the animal economy of the other. Prof. St. George Mivart, after thoroughly reviewing all the zoological affinities of the *Simiadæ* and *Cebidæ*, comes to the following conclusion: "Moreover, as man is the highest animal, and, zoologically considered, differs less from even the lowest ape than such ape differs from any other animal, man and apes must be placed together in one order, which may well bear its primitive Linnæan name 'Primates.'" Granted; but the minds of these zoological congeners are separated by a measureless interval. The ape and the man are infinite leagues apart, in the kind of thinking they are respectively able to do. If both are anatomically Primates, mentally the one is human, and the other is a brute. "From a spiritual point of view," to adopt the language of Joseph Le Conte, himself one of those broadly liberal scientists, for whom the spiritual still remains the most conspicuous and comprehensive phenome-

non in the universe—"From a spiritual point of view it is simply impossible to exaggerate man's importance or the wideness of the gap which separates him from the higher animals. From this point of view man must be set over as an equivalent, not only against the whole animal kingdom, but against all nature beside. From this point of view, as we shall see, nature may be said to exist only for man—nature the matrix, man the offspring. From this point of view, the difference which separates man from the highest ape is far greater than that which separates the latter from the lowest moner. In fact, the former difference is incommensurable in terms of the latter." Indeed, we may add, when the facts are well weighed, it is difficult to suppress the suspicion that, in the matter of zoological classification, some lurking error has vitiated the result, or some vast determining fact has slid away from the gaze of the most penetrating search.

Now in thus emphasizing the wideness of the gap between the human and the brute, no slight is intended to any well settled zoological affinities between the lower animals and man; no disparagement of science, in so far as it sets up honestly in the interest of the ape. We may feel the force of this difference, and yet be none the less sensible of the vast community of animal nature, which two such diverse branches of the same great kingdom may indiscriminately share. Sidney Smith has put this same thought into a famous piece of wit: "I confess myself so much at ease about the superiority of mankind; I have such a marked contempt for the understanding of every baboon I have ever seen; I feel so sure that the blue ape without a tail will never rival us in poetry, painting, and music, that I see no reason whatever that justice may not be done to the few fragments of soul, and tatters of understanding, that monkeys may really possess."

Indeed, the dog comes nearer man in all those lofty traits which are inseparable from the human understanding, such as keen and sympathetic penetration into the ways of man, capacity to read the will of the master on his countenance, the most touching devotion to those who cherish him, and a

worship that borders well nigh upon the confines of religion. Stories of the remarkable animal intelligence of this favorite companion and servant of man, of how he has laid his plans for bringing about the will of his master, pursuing them through days and even weeks of preliminary preparation for the event; of how he has clung to his master in misfortune, in times and places where human help and sympathy could not come—a kind of devotion which, more than mere sagacity, bespeaks the human element in effigy—stories of this sort are transmitted to us from all ages of the world, and are authenticated by the frequent occurrence of like examples observed in our own day, justifying the opinion that the dog, despite the absence of zoological affinities, is immeasurably nearer man than the grinning caricature of the jungles. Here is the psychology of the dog, as given to us by an eminent naturalist, Jacob Gibson: "There are few human passions not shared in by the dog. It is, like man, subject to anger, jealousy, envy, love, hatred, grief; it shows gratitude, pride, generosity, and fear. It sympathizes with man in his troubles, and there are numerous instances on record of its showing sympathy for the distressed of its own kind. It remembers, and is evidently assisted thereto, as man is, by the association of ideas; that it is not devoid of imagination may be assumed from the fact that it dreams, pursuing in its sleep imaginary game. Its judgment is often singularly correct; while it may almost be said to have a religion in which man is its god, and his will its rule of conduct, disobedience to which produces an evident feeling of shame and a quiet submission to punishment. It shares with man in awe of the unknown, and the most courageous dog will often tremble at the sudden rustle of a leaf." So like man in mental characteristics is the dog; where in comparison is the ape?

Take the element of devotion, loving, strong, heroic devotion, and it will be found that next to man, and even sometimes to the disparagement of man, this emotion is purest in the bosom of the dog. In the Odyssey, there is the touching story of the old dog Argos, instantly recognizing his master

Ulysses, after an absence of twenty years, and in spite of the disguise of the beggar's rags, whereby all the gay Achaian princes were deceived. The dog in the intervening years has been so neglected, and has grown so old and diseased, that he is not able to rise from the unseemly spot on which he is lying, "a poor old cast-off, of his lord forlorn," but gives unmistakable tokens that he knows his master, when all that brilliant company and even the queen herself, are still in the dark:

> —"Soon as he perceived
> Long-lost Ulysses nigh, down fell his ears
> Close-capped, and with his tail glad signs he gave
> Of gratulation, impotent to rise
> And to approach his master as of old.
> Ulysses, noting him, wiped off a tear
> Unmarked."

And the legend goes on to say, that the dog was so overpowered by the discovery, that he died there at his master's feet.

We have also the story, so pathetically celebrated in poems by Wordsworth and Scott, of the young and gifted man who lost his way on the Helvellyn mountain, and fell at last among the cliffs to pine away and die. His faithful dog kept watch by his body for three long months, until it had wasted to a skeleton, finding nourishment for himself meanwhile, it is not known how, clinging piteously to his dead master in silent grief or fruitless howlings, until a straying shepherd was lured by his wailings to the desolate spot. To Walter Scott, of all writers of romance, belongs the distinction of having first made a hero of the dog. Particularly in the Talisman, it will be remembered, a most intricate scheme for ferreting out a royal offender, and bringing him to condign punishment, is accomplished through the dog as detective. Scarcely can it be charged that the details of that thrilling narrative are unnatural and strained, for Sir Walter had been a close and sympathetic observer of the dog, and was stimulated thus to idealize his exploits, by a wide range of authentic facts on the marvels of the canine instincts.

Now, turning to the zoological cousin of man, whoever heard of anything like disinterested devotion in an ape?

Cunning you will note, and almost the utter absence of sympathy for the human kind; whilst his great faculty of imitation enables him only to intensify the grotesqueness of his *ensemble.* He catches no distinctly human trait, and no amount of ape-culture, or contact with civilization, will divest him of the skulking, insincere, Caliban-like baseness of his nature. Not even Caliban is he. Shakespeare, in his play of the Tempest, has invented a character, in which he doubtless designed to express all the untamed animal impulses of human nature in a condition of monstrous development, with the higher, more distinctively human attributes in a state of utter inertia or death. But Caliban is not the missing link. Base, monstrous, deformed, puppy-headed, fish-like, man-beast that he is, he nevertheless ranks with the drunken Stephano, has the gift of language, and, like that swaggering old Salt, can intelligently relish a bottle of sack. His wits kindle, even, on that sort of inspiration, and whilst he goes on cringing, and crawling, and fawning, in the meanest servility to his drunken masters, begging the privilege of licking the shoe of Stephano, yet the whole machinery of the play progresses under his guidance, and we can easily see that he is no upward struggle from the chimpanzee tribe, but an animal man, born and bred under an atrophy of his higher powers.

Considered simply in the light of anatomy, we confess to a strange commingling of emotions, when we look at the ape. He seems a burlesque on the human form—a burlesque in which, also, there is some sad symbolism to be conveyed of what the animal nature is, when cut loose from the divine image, which, in the original type, the Creator designed to be in supremacy over it. Psychologically—as is indexed by the absence of language—the ape does not think, in the special human sense in which we have defined that term; and all his peculiar traits, his chattering, his skulking, his thievish and vindictive habits, his low cunning, his ogreish look, only conspire to give him special pre-eminence in that catalogue of ghoulish creatures, which the poet seizes on for the malign imagery they afford. He is

with the owls, and bats, and jackals, that haunt the ruins of decayed civilizations, and is, without doubt, the satyr which the prophet describes as dancing in the rubbish of Chaldee's faded excellency. And all the while, if you look into his eye, you will discover an expression of unrelieved sadness; he never twinkles you the faintest smile; he has always a haggard, worn, oldish look, as if nature had purposely fixed him up as a salutary scandal on her higher product, when that higher product lets itself down into the excesses of sensuality and lust.

MAX MUELLER AND LINGUISTIC ROOTS.

At this point the inquiry will intrude: What kind of thought is it, that we can confidently set down as the specific attribute of man, so far beyond the capabilities of the brute, as to awaken the presumption that it was originally inherent in his human type. Max Mueller has waged a life long battle in support of the proposition, that the faculty of language, and the psychological conditions it implies, is the impossible barrier between man and the brute. It must be conceded that a very strong argument is derived from this quarter. The roots of all the great families of tongues, so far as ascertained, are *conceptual* in character, that is, they already embody the results of abstract thinking; and the unavoidable inference is that such kind of thinking must have been present when these roots were made. For example, a large class of words in the various branches of the great Indo-European family are reducible at last to the root *space*, and, in that indeterminate shape it is as yet no part of speech, but simply expresses in the most general way the act of *seeing*. All verbal roots are of the same kind; they are general terms, and imply that this distinctively human power of abstract thinking was in play when they came into use. Now if man, under the law of evolution, made insensible approaches toward this kind of thinking, at last attaining it, we should have the marks of the successive stages of his progress in the linguistic roots, which are the unresolvable elements of which all human speech is composed. But it is

alleged that no such traces are found; and there is even a confounding absurdity in supposing such traces possible in the premises. If these roots originated under the law of *onomatopœia*: if it could be clearly shown that they were in the beginning imitative sounds, or emotional utterances, such as brutes do always make, it might be an allowable inference, that they insensibly crept out of this fashion into conceptual terms. But the roots are visibly not of imitative origin, and even if they were, there is still the insuperable *prolepsis* of working up a general term from a particular one, when, by supposition, the faculty for generalization is not on hand. All imitative and interjectional sounds imply only such *perceptive* thinking on individual objects as animals must possess; but *conception*, or abstraction in definitely outlined areas of consciousness, the faculty implicated in all known linguistic roots, cannot be thought of as emerging from the other without language, and yet language, as we find it, cannot be thought of without conception as its psychological root.

So, then, how shall language come in? The faculty cannot be born without it, and it cannot be born without the faculty. The same thing must be parent and offspring at one and the same time. As a matter of fact, the roots are conceptual, therefore the first utterances of men were made when the faculty of abstract thinking was fully fledged in the mind. The only way I can see out of this difficulty, under the law of evolution, is, to conceive of immense progress *per saltem*, a paroxysmal advance, whereby the brain of man, in spanning vast reaches of organization, comes up with the new faculty born in its folds. If this occurs under the all-wise disposal of a superintending Mind, it is quite equivalent to the special creation in which the old-time philosophers were wont to believe. And this, indeed, Prof. Joseph Le Conte has put forward as one of the elements of a solution of the difficulty we have on hand, holding that "the ascent of matter and of force, though in orderly succession, is *not by infinite gradation*, is not by a sliding scale, but always *by paroxysms*; and therefore are the several conditions of matter and force prop-

erly represented, not by an ascending inclined plane, but by a series of platforms raised one above another, with blank spaces between." Thus "under appropriate conditions, characteristic nerve phenomena—sensation, consciousness, will spring suddenly into existence as by birth; not only without gradation, but gradation in this case is simply inconceivable, for no one can even think sensation, consciousness, and will in terms of material phenomena—*i. e.* in terms of motion."*

SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS—COMTE AND RICHTER.

Two things we may set down as settled in our experience: First, that anatomically and psychologically the animal and man run in parallel lines for a certain distance; and, second, that there comes an epoch for the man, which as a matter of fact never arrives for the animal, and we strongly suspect was never intended to arrive for the animal, when self-consciousness is born, and the man feels, even when he cannot intellectually report it, that he is eternally distinct from every object he beholds. The dawning of the *ego* is it? the consciousness of the *me* as distinguished from the *not me*, in the language of the schools — the faculty, at all events, which the new school of Positive philosophers have so unanimously agreed to scout, the capacity, the human spirit has for being itself subject and object at the same time. This was the great puzzle and bug-bear of Auguste Comte, that the mind should be conceived as subject and object at the same time. He raged about it; he thought it the climax of absurdity, about as sensible as for a man to try to see himself on the back of his head. How can a man turn around and look at himself? For, do you not see, when he turns himself around the man he wants to see turns around with him? Of course, all this was necessary in one who would identify the mind with the brain, and reduce all psychology to "a simple prolongation of animal physiology properly so called." He must study the nerve: he cannot study himself, for that involves the absurdity denounced.

*See a remarkable article by, Prof. Joseph Le Conte, on "Man's Place in Nature," in the Princeton Review, Nov. 1878.

Alas! how easy it is for men in psychological matters to deceive themselves with material analogies. You cannot, indeed, see yourself on the back of your head, if you should twist your eyes out of their sockets to do it—but, it is involved in the very nature of self-consciousness, that the mind should look in upon itself, This very thing it does, however absurd it may seem to those who fix their biological formulas on it, and insist on reducing all mental movements to neurological throbs. Nay! it is specifically this capacity which setts off the intellect of man, in a *discrete degree* above the highest stage of the understanding of the brute. We must attach some value to the experiences of those who affirm, that they are able to recall the time, the exact date, when the consciousness of self flashed in on them, as the revelation of a new world. Jean Paul Richter states his own case thus: "Never shall I forget the phenomenon in myself never till now recited, when I stood by the birth of my own self-consciousness, the place and time of which are distinct in my memory. On a certain forenoon I stood, a very young child, within the house-door, and was looking out toward the wood pile, when, in an instant, the inner revelation, 'I am I,' like lightning from heaven, flashed and stood brightly before me; in that moment had I seen myself as I, for the first time and forever." Previous to this event, Jean Paul was a creature of instincts, like the cat and dog with which he found his pastime, excepting that the germ of that distinctively human faculty was awaiting in him to bourgeon, and did actually break out into conscious exercise, at the time and place specified. The poet Tennyson does not recall the experience in his own history, but he sets forth the coming on of the epoch in the finished adornments of his verse, like apples of gold in pictures of silver:

> The baby, new to earth and sky,
> What time his tender palm is pressed
> Against the circle of his breast,
> Has never thought that this is I.
>
> But as he grows, he gathers much,
> And learns the use of I and me,

And finds I am not what I see,
And other than the things I touch.

So rounds he to a separate mind,
From whence clear memory may begin,
As thro' the frame that binds him in,
His isolation grows defined.—*Tennyson—In Mem.*

TESTIMONY OF THE POETS—SHAKESPEARE.

This suggests that the poets are far more profoundly versed in the subtleties of man's spiritual nature, than are the philosophers themselves. They are unwittingly our best metaphysicians, because, I apprehend, they fix on all the grand spiritual facts of human nature, with such a sympathetic grasp as retains them alive; whereas the steel-traps of the dialecticians often kill them in catching. Taking up Shakespeare, we find a living psychology glowing in all his plays. Pondering well the ruminating Hamlet, or the conscience-stricken Macbeth, or the desolate Lear, or the melancholy Jacques, one would never think of calling in question the possibility of the mind being subject and object at the same time. And so with Milton's Satan, and Dante's Bertand de Born in Inferno, in whom the double consciousness is represented under the awful figure of a decapitated man, bearing his own severed head in his fingers, from which issued loud imprecations upon him as upon another self:

"I truly saw, and still I seem to see it,
A trunk without a head walk in like manner
As walked the others of the mournful herd.
And by the hair it held the head dissevered,
Hung from the hand in fashion of a lantern,
And that upon us gazed and said: "O me!"
It of itself made to itself a lamp,
And they were two in one, and one in two;
How that can be He knows who so ordains it."

Longfellow's Dante—Inferna XXVIII.

But it is in Shakespeare that these living psychologies do most abound. Take, for example, the feeling of remorse, which this great master has so consummately painted in the reverberating conscience of Macbeth. What is it, but the soul turning inward upon itself, to fix the sharp edges of its

retributary fangs upon its own vitals—*re*, back again, and *mordere*, to bite. The guilty spirit becomes mordant, so to speak, on its own substance, and gnaws, and gnaws, at the heart's core, as if in this corrosive way it would eat out the bloody spot from the soul. Untrammeled by the subtleties of the metaphysicians, the great poet, by a truer instinct, finds the frenzied murderer of Duncan clutching for the very essence of his personality, the very *ego*, the very vital centre of his being, as that upon which the awful curse of Cain was being legibly branded. The Furies cry after him, determined to identify him, by all the titles by which he was known; a voice from the invisible:

> "Still it cried *Sleep no more!* to all the house:
> *Glamis hath murdered sleep; and therefore Cawdor*
> *Shall sleep no more,—Macbeth shall sleep no more!*"

—Glamis, Cawdor, Macbeth, the very being of Macbeth, hath forfeited sleep forever.

THOUGHT AND THING.

These elucidations, it may be presumed, will make it sufficiently clear that thought is after all the differentiating attribute of man. But our theme has wider applications. If thought has so decisive an office in man, why may it not be discovered to be the significant reality, indeed the only reality, in all this system of things of which our universe consists. Reality! what is that? If I ask myself the question: What is it in me that makes up the reality of my inner spiritual being?—the answer must be: The faculty I have of thinking on myself, or self-consciousness, whereby I perceive myself to be a distinct, separate, free, personality in a universe of things. In other words, my reality I place in the thinking I do. *Cogito ergo sum* may be bad in logic, but it is most felicitous in fact. The great Descartes could well afford to build up his stupendous system on these three happily chosen and powerfully significant words. It is too late in the day, indeed, to stand up for the detail of his system, but never too late to urge that, in that great formula, he has indicated the deepest reality of which the human spirit can be cognizant, namely, thought.

But what we must note now is, that not only I myself, but everything else, must come to me in the garb of thought. I shall know nothing except as it shall get for me some embodiment in thought; and it is hard to think this possible, except on the condition that, previous to my knowing it, it was already an embodiment of thought—divine thought, it may be, but thought nevertheless. And so, running out into the universe around us, we shall find, everywhere, that thought, thought, is the all comprehensive reality, the sole reality, lying always at the heart of things, without which they would drop asunder into a very limbo of crazy fragments.

Take anything, from a pebble to a star, the flower that blows at your feet, the precious ores that creep through the fissures of the rocks, the sunlight, the dew, the sea holding carnival in its watery wastes, civilizations surging through valleys, and out upon vast sea-boards and virgin continents in the west, governments, religions, sciences, art—everything *is* because of the thought that is in it, and because of its power of stimulating thought in us. Take the most worthless thing we know of, the green scum upon the mantling pool—science revels in it, rejoicing in the discovery of miniature worlds there, with *fauna* and *flora* to fit, all subject to the same great laws of order which prevail in the larger worlds. A brief time with the microscope will reveal monstrous creatures swarming in tropical seas, and great forests, through whose labyrinths innumerable slimy things hold their tortuous way. Now the scientist is satisfied when he has found out the law of this infinitesimal world and mastered the phenomena of life in these far-off primitive sources. But these observations and inferences must come to him in the habiliments of thought.

HUXLEY AND PROTOPLASM.

There is not only thought in the process, but the glow of rapt thinking, the intense fervor of mental excitement, that is always experienced when discoveries are made. If one would know what the thrill of achievement is, he should follow Mr. Huxley, in his exhilarating chase for *protoplasm*,

through the microscopic chambers of the sting of a nettle. The first movements of life are obviously there, and one comes out from the investigation with the strange sense of having trodden well nigh upon the borders of that region, where are the well-springs of that subtle something that has blossomed into worlds. But the discovery is valuable in the shape of a thought—eliminate that thought, and the thing dwindles to nothing, or at best an annoying sting in the flesh.

Let us note Mr. Huxley as he bends over this newly discovered substance. He is full of excitement. His whole frame trembles with agitation, as from this dim world the strange phenomenon works itself out intelligibly to his view. And what is it he sees? Motion? He has seen that a thousand times. But here is *first* vital *motion*, as he conceives; motion in that far-off limit of the organic world, where it has very much the appearance of having the power within itself, vital motion self-generated, and the primitive fountain of all other motions and forces with which the organic world abounds.* His conception of that substance may turn out, in course of time, to be, in large part, a stupendous blunder, as self-generated motion is a logical *felo-de-se*, but his theory of its nature is, for the time being, the all of *protoplasm* for him. The restless little current, blown by no wind, stirred by no surrounding agitation, so far as we can see, seems to circulate of its own accord; now, if the assumption of spontaneous movement be a mistake, and, in due time, the nature of force should be more accurately understood, the proposition is still true, that the significance of the substance lies in the nature of the thought it conveys. What else is meant by the law of things, after which the mind of man is perpetually striving, and the more or less approximately attaining of which gives science its title-deed to our confidence,—what else but the

*See Huxley's Lay Sermon on "The Physical Basis of Life," in which he assumes that the living compound—protoplasm—from dead constituents—carbonic acid and ammonia—may be defined in terms of its own properties, which is the same thing as to say that life is self-generated.

eternal thought-reality that in them inheres. When men discover the laws of things, they are but eliminating the thought that is in them. They are getting at the ideal law, which they assume to be the absorbing reality in the constitution of things. A flower in my hand, for example, the substantial thing about it is, not the number nor delicate penciling of its petals, nor the quantity or kind of vegetable mass that enters into its composition, but the ideal type in accordance with which it was fashioned, and, withal, the beauty it flashes on my mind.

SCIENCE AND SYMBOL.

Much of the turmoiling and alarm of modern science might have been avoided, if it had been distinctly understood from the first, that nature is legitimately to be studied in two ways, scientifically, and in the way of symbol.* It is the signal misapprehension of our time, that nature is adapted solely for *use*, that is, solely to minister to the physical necessities of man. Man is only a physiological machine, and the highest you can say of nature is, that it is the motor-power whereby this machine is run. Even this is too much to say, for the struggle for existence makes all such adaptations the accidental out-come of the crossing of blind forces, that are working for no such end. It is in accordance with the materialistic temper of our age, to obliterate entirely all those higher sentiments of men that are not specifically of the analytical cast. Whatever the mind gathers in communion with nature, as a *picture*, must pass for nothing, or, at best, must be reckoned a mere idle dream, a moping, mawkish frittering away of time and opportunity, in a world where the sternest practical necessity drives men to grapple with a conspiracy of refractory or hostile forces. A man wants food and shelter for himself and his children, and, when everything is counted in, this, we are told, is the sum of his wants. But nature will not spontaneously furnish a

*See a richly suggestive discourse, by Canon Mozley, on "Nature" in his University Sermons.

mouthful for his table, nor a shred for his back; she must, therefore, be conquered to his behests. And it has been found by experience, that these unsympathetic forces will not yield to the stolid and uncalculating industry of man, plodding away with brutish muscle and strain; but to science they speedily succumb, as to the sceptre of their undisputed queen. All nature's resources are poured out in unstinted abundance at the waving of her wand; streams rush into water-wheels, and make them flying engines of manufacture, or, otherwise, are turned into steam, and become the wings of commerce, sweeping through all lands, and hovering over every sea; mountains are tunneled; floods are spanned; space outstript; storms forestalled; disease caught in its lurking places, and human poverty and squalor chased from the earth.

What science is, in this system of thinking, does not so readily appear, since a power that is regnant over nature ought, somehow, to be above its control; but, by supposition, all things come and go under the fixedness of mechanical law, and science, being but a battery in the brain, must discharge its energies in obedience to, and by no means in governance of, the same inexorable law. Nevertheless, the theory is, that if men will occupy themselves in this way, scientifically upon nature, and upon the great social systems, and mighty civilizations, that get their birth from the conquests of nature, they will be rationally employed, and draw from nature all she was intended to convey. The æsthetic or histrionic teaching of nature is a myth; and they who imagine that mountains and stars can express themselves in any other way, worthy of our notice, than in scientific formula, are set down as dreamy, visionary mortals, to be pitied or contemned as their case may require. And yet it is true, not only that nature's resources in the way of symbol are practically infinite, but also that, in this way alone, she imparts a knowledge of her highest truths. Let us briefly bring this to a practical test.

Moral and æsthetical truths are, beyond all question, higher than those which address themselves to the physical necessities of man. Thus love, in whatever way formulated, is a more stupendous fact than electricity, under whatever as-

pect that mighty cosmic energy may be contemplated. Again, all force shrinks in the presence of a free-will, so that in this one little spot of self-active personality, no matter if I can metaphorically cover it with the point of my finger, we have that which will easily outweigh all worlds, and make them as dust in the balance. Formulate your stars and systems that roll forever under the fixed necessity of cause and effect, compute their physical magnitudes, and say how, in teeming myriads, they swarm in an immensity that has absolutely no bounds; and then, along side of all this, place a single free-will, and the worlds are to it, as a clod is to a palpitating brain.

Now, nature, as a picture, ministers to these higher ideas in man, brings him these higher truths, so exclusively, indeed, that to the extent in which science, or any other alien influence, will mar the picture, the impression is not made. The botanist makes cross-sections of a flower, and otherwise tears it to pieces, to discover its inherent law, but, meantime, its beauty has perished, and that is an immeasurably greater element than any discovery he may have made in the intricacies of classification and use—so much greater, that almost without qualification we could accept Keats' orphic saying, concluding all truth under the single attribute that has perished in the botanist's hands:

> "Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty"—that is all
> Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know."

It is true, if after killing this flower, and destroying its beauty, in the interests of science, after having feasted his soul to fullness on the dry matter of structure and use, the botanist will then turn back on Gœthe's method, and get by synthesis, what previously his analysis destroyed—in other words, if he will transfer his scientific knowledge from the dead flower, to one that is still unplucked, and in bloom, he may have a more intelligent appreciation of its beauty, than if the added knowledge had not been obtained. But it is, after all, as picture and symbol, and not by any means as scientific detail, that its impression is made.

TENNYSON AND THE CLOUDS.

Take another illustration. It is the mission of the poet to discover, and proximately to express, the lofty meanings which nature as symbol was intended to convey. He sits at her feet, not to elicit her instructions in the labored process of doubtfully-plodding and oft-repeated experiment, but, by flashes of insight, to interpret the thought that illuminates her face. Now here are clouds, dark, lowering, thunder-clouds, rolling ominously around the sky. Suppose the poet Tennyson, and some meteorologist, Lieut. Maury for example, in the presence of these clouds. They are both musing on the clouds, but the meteorologist, if any conception of sublimity is awakened in him by the sight, must give it no place, but must go on to think only of isotherms, and isobars, of the scale of the winds, of barometric pressure, of the weather rose, and of the details of scientific investigation concerning the origin, growth, path, and decay of storms—all, no doubt, of thrilling interest to Mr. Maury, and of great practical benefit to the fleets of the world. Mr. Tennyson may be so ignorant of these things as not even to have heard the terms; but he is in grief over a loved one, lost in his prime, lost beyond the sea, and the great problems of human existence and destiny, vaster than any problems of material comfort whatsoever, are pressing him for solution. And so the cloud becomes, in a manner, the congenial imagery of his grief, and the interpreter of the dark struggle through which he is passing:

> "And but for fear it is not so,
> The wild unrest that lives in woe,
> Would dote and pore on yonder cloud.
>
> That rises upward always higher,
> And onward drags a laboring breast,
> And topples round the dreary west,
> A looming bastion fringed with fire."—*In Mem. XV.*

Conflicting passions are struggling in the bosom of the poet. Now he fancies that the vessel that brings home the body of his deceased friend, Arthur Hallam, is gliding over

a smooth and placid sea, otherwise he should tremble before the commotion which the rising storm is making in the branches; on the other hand, foreboding that the same storm might imperil the precious freight on the sea, restrains him from such wild brooding as his grief would impel, making fond love to the gloomy thunder-cloud. That cloud were most fitting symbol of his grief, if he were unmolested in its indulgence. He could "dote and pore" over it, because it bespeaks the dark pall which the death of his friend has let fall upon his spirit, and the throes of the mighty questionings of the mystery, before that pall will be removed. But we must not fail to note, that, to the poet's vision, that laboring thunder-cloud was "rising upward always higher," and that by and by, its great heaving mass begins to topple round the dreary west, and the sun-bursts break over the dissolving ramparts, and all the gloomy summits are kindled, at last, with an intense margin of glory—"A looming bastion fringed with fire." So that grief has not blackened all the empyrean of the poet, and the great struggle he has, the struggle we all must have, the awful questionings of life and death, sense and spirit, whence and whither, which the pangs of bereavement impel us to answer, this struggle is relieved now by the upward heaving of the sorrow, to that altitude at which it can at least catch on its tips the light of retreating day. Interpreted thus, the fire-fringed bastion looms up before us, as the condensed symbol, for all those religious and philosophic wrestlings through which the soul passes, from the despair and paralysis of the first great shock in life, on through alternations of doubt and assurance, vanquishments and defeats, fear and triumph, until at last it mounts those serene heights, whence it may "overlook the tumult from afar," and know of a surety that all is well.

Themes such as these can receive no direct elucidation from the teachings of science; and, indeed, the probings of analysis will invariably send them to the limbo of dreams. When, therefore, the scientist trespasses upon these realms, with his crucibles, and scales, and lenses, and re-agents, and finds nothing there to which his clumsy apparatus will fit, he should

not come back heralding that it is a region of mist. Let him remember the friendly antithesis of *ποίησις* and *νόησις*; let him understand that poetry is too large an element in the intellectual economy of the race, to be set down in any secondary place, much less to be banished entirely from the field. The highest truths are hers, and she gets them from nature by a species of inspired insight, to which the scientific consciousness is an utter stranger. Therefore Tennyson does not wrestle with these problems by marshaling around the battalions of his logic, or lifting a causeway of proportions over their yawning abysses, but by falling with his

> "weight of cares,
> Upon the great world's altar stairs,
> That slope through darkness up to God."

All the highest philosophy known to the human heart is compassed in the *In Memoriam*, love, grief, life, death, immortality, hope, doubt, aspiration, faith, the scope and limitations of the finite mind in its divining of the Infinite; meantime, all the universe has become to the eyes of the poet a book of symbols, 'half revealing, half concealing the answering soul within'—a chamber of imagery, which he has diligently traced for 'little flashes, mystic hints,' figures of speech, which like doors opening inward, would conduct further and further toward the penetration of the insolvable mystery, until at last its ineffable glories should burst on his view. And, although he could make no spectrum analysis of the *Shekinah* therein witnessed, as high priest of nature he will have legibly emblazoned on his breast-plate the record of

> "That God, which ever lives and loves,
> One God, one law, one element,
> And one far off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves."

"PLATO THOU REASONEST WELL."

The matter to be urged, as a corollary to all this is, that nature, in whatever way studied, whether scientifically or as symbol, whether in the crucible of the chemist, or in the frenzy of the poet, reduces itself, at last and always, to an ideal

something, a thought, a truth, a word, the Logos, indeed, by which the worlds were made, and without which was nothing made that was made. Democritus has long enough ruled in our modern world. Let Plato, with his sublime doctrine of archetypes, return again to his wonted strolls in the Academy, and teach men that all finite things *evolve*—if it must be—in accordance with pre-existing ideas in the mind of the Creator, coming out, at last, in flower and star, in brute and man, as the *concreted thought of God*, in much the same way as the artist conceives an ideal Apollo, and then chisels it in marble. We feel a fledging prophecy, that a *neo-platonism*, springing naturally from the exigencies and gropings of the scientific mind of our country, is already in full retinue for coronation, the last and highest hope of philosophy. There need be no fear that nature will lose any of its attractions, or any of its vast utilitarian significance, under the new *instauration;* for already all the finer instincts of cultured understandings, and all the broadest generalizations of science, point more and more distinctly to the final estimate of nature as but an intermediate term between mind and mind. *You* and *I* are pronouns now fallen into disrepute, but if I wish to communicate with you, that is, if I would pass over to you the result of my spiritual activity, my thought, I can do it only through the intermediation of a nature that lies in between us. A gesture symbolizes a thought, the intonation and articulation of the breath from the lungs will convey the meaning in sound; but, in any event, the movement, the sound, the subtle workings of the countenance, are but the incarnating of thought in material forms, the flashing of intellect over intervening wires to an intellect at the other end.

OUR SCHOOLING UNDER THE STARS.

It remains only to gather up, briefly, the inspiring lesson our theme suggests. We are living in a universe of thought. All things about us, from the tiniest gossamer that floats in the air, to the great blazing comet, that flaunts its tail over half the sky, and has centuries for its cycle, are pouring down upon us an infinity of thought, and we are so constituted

that we may forever take it in. Our schooling is under the stars; and we have great oceans, and mountains, and rivers, and groves, and surging generations of men, and the deep and awful voices of history, and above all the God-man, for our instructors. They have all one voice. The divine is struggling for expression. These worlds that so bewilder us with their number and immensity, springing up from chaos, and bearing on their bosoms the rich garniture of perpetual summers; and humanity, as it pushes onward through emigrations, and wars, and latitudes, and civilizations, and diplomacies, and the finer cultivations of science and religion—all are respectively unfolding the divive idea that gave them birth. Yon star, for instance,—we cannot for a moment imagine that it struggled up by accident from the primeval mist. A divine thought shot itself into that radiant habit, so to speak, and ever since the star has been making its history in plastic conformity to that regulating idea. And this is also true of the meanest flower that blows, of the wildest savage that roams the African jungle,s of all forms of life, from those we crush beneath our feet to the sacred temple that enshrines the soul of man. Everywhere the divine thought, which, in some inconceivably far-past time, emerged from the bosom of Infinity, and concreted in space, is working itself out in successive stages of more and more perfect self-realization, and will go on in the unending career upon which it has entered. It is thrilling to know that we are part of this process; to feel that we can consciously come, each hour of the day, into communion with the thoughts of God; nay more and better, that His highest thought is struggling to be realized in us.

ARTICLE VI.

ACTING FROM PRINCIPLE.*

By M. VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.

"Leaving the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on to perfection, Heb. 6 : 1.

The leaving of 'principles' here meant is not abandonment of them, but progress in and upon them. It is assumed that in them the proper starting point for life is secured and true progress made possible. Principles are never to be left behind, but held fast as the strong and infallible lines of advance and ascent, until he who at first had nothing but them, has found all things through their action, and stands at last complete in righteousness and safe at his proper goal.

The proprieties of this occasion, my young friends, call for the consideration of some truth that shall throw directing and helpful light on your path. From the seclusion in which your College studies have held you, you are about to pass into a broader and more trying sphere of activity. Here you reach a line beyond which life becomes more consciously real and earnest, amid the work, conflict and service in which your mission on earth is to be fulfilled. As expressing at once the highest fact of preparation you should find in yourselves from the past years of study, and the needful thing that should mark your lives in the great future into which you go, I desire your attention to the subject of *acting from principle*, thus suggested by the text I have read. I am sure there is something here in which your education has been meant to mould and establish you, and which, as a law of life, ought to stretch its golden guiding onward till you are safe in heaven and crowned with glory.

I. We will do well, first of all, to clear our view of *what it is to act from principle.* This point is misty in the minds of many. The loose handling commonly given to the subject

* Baccalaureate Discourse to the class of '78, delivered June 23, 1878.

is seen in the easy ways in which the duty is often looked upon as met. A clear conception of what it really means and embraces will help to give it a better grasp upon our lives.

Principles, in the broad sense, you all know, are fundamental forms of law. They are the primordial conditions, the beginnings, and guiding forces for any kind of movement or phenomena. We speak of the principles of a science —the chief elements and laws of action determining and explaining its facts. We speak of the principles of vegetable life—the energies and fixed methods in which plant organizations come from seeds to open flowers or luscious fruits. We speak of the principles of animal physiology—the forces and laws of life and continuity under which its wonderful structures are formed and the sentient creation comes to its enjoyments. We speak of the principle of gravitation—that somewhat which appears as a force, with its laws of manifestation, under which are produced the curves of falling bodies and the singing harmonies of the planetary motions. All through physical nature there is found the action of principles, out of which arise all the orderly and beneficent structures of the cosmos. When we pass across to the realm of the moral world, it is seen to be just as truly a constitution of principles. Hence we speak of the principles of piety, of truth, of justice, of purity, of love, of kindness, of self-sacrifice—each being some deep and abiding reality in the forces and connections of moral life, entering into the formation of character and the welfare of spiritual natures, some established law of action and consequences, out of which comes the weal or woe of men. These, and all the other great laws which form the grand framework of the system of duty, are as real and settled as are any of the laws that hold the material universe together and are set for the guidance of nature's movement to its right issues. All the high and blessed ends for which the moral world has been constituted, and to which even material nature looks, depend on conformity of life to these principles. As when atoms of soil, air, and moisture are to form a flower, an oak or a fig-tree, they must start from and follow the fixed order

of vegetable life, so if human character is to be rightly formed and move to its true glory and joy, it must be animated and controlled by the great and immutable principles that God has, out of His own perfect nature, established for the order and movement of our being and activity.

The "principles of the doctrine of Christ" must be viewed as standing for and including the whole circle of life-principles for man. And justly so. For Christ is the heart and sum of all truth; and there is no principle of human duty, order and welfare that the 'truth in Him' does not include and vitalize. It sweeps the whole circle of men's duties, from the grandest to the most minute, in all their relations to God, their fellowmen, to their own nature and destiny, to time and eternity. There is no possible right thing it does not require—no conceivable wrong it does not forbid. God has included all true principles of duty in the "doctrine of Christ," as He has all the colors of the rainbow in the beam of pure white light.

To act from principle, then, is to adopt and follow, with submissive temper and steadfast firmness, all the great archaic laws of right and duty founded in the constitution of the world, and revealed through conscience and the word of God, by which life and activity have been meant to be regulated and guided to their blessed goal. It means a life of holy and scrupulous rectitude, in which alway the first and decisive question is: What is right?—a life not subjected to the mercy of whims, passions, the expediencies of utility, the perversions of custom or popular drifts, but anchored to the the stabilities of righteousness; or rather, moving to the guiding force of every divine rule and sentiment of duty. And the demand is not for the easy and elastic relation which many seem to think enough to fulfill it. The fidelity required is something far beyond the playing fast and loose, the the India-rubber elasticities, the vane-like swinging to changing breezes, exhibited in the uncertainty, vacillation and compromising, the selfishness, craft and shrewdness, the calculation, scheming and sham, the deceptions, forgetfulness or recklessness of thousands who would like to be counted men

of principle. It requires more faithfulness and consistency than you see in common lives. It means that each man in his own sphere or calling, whatever it be, be true, as needle to the pole, to every obligation of justice, piety, love, service, and straight-forwardness—a loyalty to God, truth and duty, that is constant and invincible under promises or menace, under soft allurements or harsh coercions, which danger cannot unnerve or dazzling prizes corrupt. It signifies that you be ready even to bear wrong rather than do it, to suffer rather than sin, and never compromise truth and righteousness for any gains of mammon, ambition, pleasure or applause.

Do not mistake this as involving the one-sidedness of character sometimes strangely associated with feality to principle. Picture it to yourselves as nothing hard, cold, rugged, heroic indeed but not beautiful, majestic but unattractive. The required fidelity has respect to *all* true principles—not only the grand ones which mean strength, firmness, and invincible virtue, but all those which are expressed by charity, meekness, humility, gentleness, prudence, delicacy; and which round out the character in all sweet graces and fill life with all its beautiful amenities and courtesies. The doctrine of Christ unites and blends the action of all right principles. The principles of charity is as divine as that of faith or hope, that of kindness as sacred as that of truth, that of tenderness as that of courage. A man, for instance, is not acting fully up to principle when he speaks the truth, unless he speaks it in love, or in doing a right thing unless he does it in the right temper and way. There is even a true principle of expediency—not expediency as compromising the right, but as maintaining it wisely and victoriously. There are no more terrible violations of principle than are sometimes committed in asserting some special one—outraging for its sake half a score of others perhaps less prominent, but just as divine and holy, and essential for the true beauty of all. It is fidelity to them in their proper harmony, balance, and symmetry, that constitutes the "beauty of holiness." The action of principle for charcter is a moral sculpture that does not merely

strike rough, heavy blows, and give you a figure massive and strong, but which, by the gentler touches, develops all the finer lines and animates each limb and feature with the graces of purest life. It is a sort of moral painting, that not only puts on the canvas a groundwork of some grand, impressive, leading colors, but adds all the soft, delicate hues in right place and well-blended shadings, until the strong outlines and spaces are filled up and the whole becomes a charm and joy.

Of course, this conformity to laws by *us*, as rational, free beings, has this peculiarity, sharply distinguishing it from the relation of inferior nature to its principles, that it must be voluntary. The fixing and holding of ourselves under their action is to be out of the free determinations of the soul—free as pure choices always are, yet sure and unfailing as the law of gravitation. This, you at once see, demands the possession of a life—a *divine* life—which shall carry in itself, as a force and law, the principles chosen, and shall move as an inner law rhythmic with the outer. None of you need be told that man, in his natural state, has no such life, except in broken and incompetent powers. None of you need be told that even the best discernments of reason and conscience alone, on which these principles were originally impressed, cannot give a full knowledge of duty. Only from the "principles" of the gospel of Christ, as the revelation of righteousness and the power of a renewed life to you, comes the possibility of the living required. The perfection of your nature and the goal of your life are reached only on this high plane of *Christian* knowledge and power. Principle can hold its true sway only in him who has it, as re-established in the law of the Spirit of life, through the recovering grace of redemption.

II. The *obligation* to this is simply the universal and immutable obligation to do right—do right for its own sake, which forms the loftiest phase of human action. "Rectitude is the supreme good of man," and the obligation to principle is indeed but another name for all the mighty and holy bonds that are upon men always to do what is right, over against

all questions of peril, advantage, gain or loss. To do right is indeed, always gain, victory, triumph, glory ; but the right is higher than its gains. Dr. Channing expresses it with great force and beauty, when he says: "We ought to think more of walking in the right path than of reaching our end. We should desire virtue more than success. If by one wrong deed we could accomplish the liberation of millions, and in no other way, we ought to feel that this good, for which, perhaps, we had prayed with an agony of desire, was denied to us by God, was reserved for other times and other hands." This is strong, but not stronger than an apostle's charge, never to "do evil that good may come."

III. The proper enforcement of this duty comes in various considerations, emphatic and impressive. Could they be fully set before your view and rightly appreciated by you, your sense of *obligation*, it seems to me, would be re-inforced by other mighty motives to it. Whilst you ought to do right for its own sake, its blessings supremely endorse and enforce it. The great want of our day, as it always is in our world which, since the fall, swings so loosely to God's throne, is more principle, a firmer grasp on all the immutable laws, in which alone, it is ordained, life is to find order, excellence and peace. The want is felt not only in the sphere of ethical life, but in every branch of human inquiry. The prime need of each *science*, for its work to-day, is a clearer apprehension of its own principles and fidelity to them. Geology wants them, even more than it wants facts. Zoology is bewildered by the want. Physiology is crying out for their guiding light. Archæology is groping from the lack. But our common, practical, moral life is, most of all, wanting in grasp on true principles ; and the damage is incalculable. Look at some of the things that urge to the life we are considering.

1. For instance, strict harmony of life with principle is *the way of best advance in true knowledge.* Each of you should press on and up in the great realm of truth. Genuine progress is always connected with true *principia*, beginnings and underlying laws. The entire world of truth is a unity ; and the man who is false to one great part, disturbs his right re-

lation to and best view of all. A good standpoint in one, opens vision all around. Strike down upon any one great principle, move along it, and it beams wide ranges of light backwards and forwards. You are then moving forward in the lines of God's thought, and they ray out true guidance. There is wonderful illuminating power in a "principle," rightly followed, and held up as a torch. Look at it. Take an illustration from the physical realm. Let it be the principle of causation, usually called the law of cause and effect. Taking it and traveling back with it, what a route it makes, with what piercing rays it penetrates, what vistas it opens up, what sources, farther away and more deeply concealed than those of the Nile, it discovers. The geologist takes it and travels back with it, and reads the histories of countless past ages, the long march of the earth's progress up from chaos, in all its steps, rock upon rock; and creates a noble science with its flashing lights of wondrous knowledge. The theologian takes it, and with its guidance, travels back and up through nature to nature's God, and rests at last in the illumination of the truths that radiate from Him. So when your life has grasped, or truly moves in any great moral principle, you are in the free range and light of immutable realities that open out into treasures of knowledge any way you may run them.

He whose life is surrendered to what is unprincipled, has put himself out of *rapport* with the deepest, greatest, purest realities of his being and the world. His course does not move with, but across the lines of God's plan, cutting them at all angles, with curves and zigzag bendings in and out, in interminable contradictions; and this moral irregularity and dishonesty must confuse and thwart the intellect and shut out the right shining of truth and knowledge into it. He is like the traveler who, instead of following the open road with the sunlight above and the free outlook open on nature's wealth and beauty on every side at every step, should turn into the thicket with no safe leading, creeping through tangled obstructions, twisting to the right and left, with no broad pros-

pects, and with light only in broken glimmers which but hint of the rich day-light from which he has wandered.

This is not fancy—it is plain, solid fact. Obedience to any truth enlarges your knowledge of that truth and of others linked with it. The practice of any principle leads you more profoundly into its meanings and connections. The best way to understand chemistry, is to take its known principles into the practical work of the laboratory or of life, and running along each as a golden thread, you will see the wondrous secrets of matter. So your obedience to principles in morals will evermore open deeper knowledge and broader realms of truth. It is simply the old, but sublime truth told us by Christ: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." And there is much in honest attitude of the soul, to make study and inquiry successful. Moral obstructions are at the root of a fearful amount of the ignorance and error, the mistakes and blunders of men. The man who trifles with his convictions, who is averse to personal practice of the principles, or any of them, belonging to a righteous, pure, unselfish, beneficent life, who does not accept the light lovingly, will not be in the way to right views or understanding of any thing. Many of the worst errors found among men, at once absurd and seemingly invincible, barring progress to the best personal, national, social, ecclesiastical conditions, have their strength and fortifications in moral causes. Look, for instance, at the blinding influences by which the liquor appetite and traffic still manage to keep their gates of woe open, and the perverse sentiment under which the enforcement of our Sabbath laws is baffled in many places. Because of love of evil, men do not come to the light. Hosts of errors are thus entrenched in human souls; thousands of understandings are darkened. Young men, athirst as I trust you are for knowledge, truly desiring to know what the truth is in all the great questions of the times, keep your souls loyal to practical duty as every true principle opens it. This will settle most questions for you. You will have an understanding heart, and the clouds will lift out of your brain. "The pure in heart shall see God,"

and in His light shall see light where others see only darkness.

2. Again, hearty practical homage to principle *will subordinate in you the lower nature to the higher, and fix in your life the action and supremacy of all that is of eternally abiding worth* A man grows, as we all know, to the mould of the ideas he enthrones in practice. Movement of his life in the rhythm of the laws of righteousness as renewed in his nature by grace, will leave no chance to the crooked and ugly depravities that are in him, but will form him to the highest personal excellence. For the purification and ennobling of his immortal character, the unbroken discipline of all these principles is of incalculable importance. In this age—perhaps not worse than others, but surely bad enough—in which simple, professional success is made to count so much in the common valuation of men, you will need be on special guard against surrender of principle to supposed advantage or profit, to chances for money, place or power. One of the strong drifts of our times is toward materialism of life. Our great progress in science and invention tend this way—enlarging the powers, utilities, and comforts of physical existence. Ways are opened up to grand, dazzling enterprises, quick fortunes, luxury, sumptuous living. Avarice, ambition, pride and vanity, are strongly stimulated. Great prizes glitter and attract; and the young are tempted to leap to their aims by short and false means, or, it may be, by long and crooked. This has increased the canker of unscrupulousness at the heart of the common life of to-day. Hence, in all spheres, from the lowest to the highest, in state, society, business, we see scheming, duplicity, artifice, subterfuge and circumvention taking the place of honesty, truth, justice and straightforwardness; men trying to live by their wits rather than by upright industries, seeking to pile up quick fortunes by sharp ingenuities or enormous risks of other people's capital. In the high places of power, the shape and shifts of diplomacies look like the crafty arbitrarinesses of a Talleyrand, a Richelieu, or a Metternich, rather than the principles

of 'the golden rule.' Political leaders substitute for care of the public good the intense game of expedients for party and personal power—many of them reminding of Wendell Phillips' cutting definition of politicians, as "gentlemen who sevre God as far as will give no offense to the devil," and the idea of Nelson who is reported to have said: "Never mind the justice or the impudence; only let me succeed." In trade and business, hosts of frauds, dishonesties, shrewd rascalities and well advertised shams are pushing to the front. In the Church there is enough of pride, show, trimming, time-serving, and "worldy-wisdom," to allow free scope to the ambiguities in which Bunyan could picture more than one Mr. Facing-both-ways — thousands with face in every direction but heavenward. These are times, therefore, in which men of moral stature and solid, unstained worth are built only through firm resistance of abounding evils and self-maintained discipline of high, undeviating principle. These are days that try every man's mettle, of what sort it is. If he consents to subordinate duty, in any degree, to the game and plausibilities of policy; if he swings loose to integrity in his business; if ends are ever made to justify means with him; if he compromisingly hides the truth in the presence of sin and error; if he adopts the maxim never to offend the prejudices and humors of wickedness about him; if he drops down to false temper and plans for even true work; then wrong and corruption will soon have their fetters on his soul, and if he is not at once limbered out into a wishy-washy nobody, he will at any rate rank far below the dignity and worth of true Christian manhood. A man weaves into himself the duplicity, unprincipledness, he practices on others, and makes a sham of himself by surrender to shams. His untrue act or word may not hurt another much, but it hurts himself deeply. Every deviation, for an end, from moral obligation, barters away some of the integrity and greatness of his own soul, and lodges in him a scar and a crookedness. Unprincipled acts, going into habits, will fasten in the fabric of character all the twists, rottennesses and shames of depravity.

The question of man's highest good has occupied the earn-

est thought of the ages. I do not now mean to enter the labyrinth of that endless speculation. But, without doubt, the good for each one of us, vital and blessed, probably, beyond all things else, is character, into which are inwrought all the great, pure, beautiful and everlasting principles given for the harmony and joy of the moral universe. We are not, indeed, to be constantly thinking and acting for our character, selfishly shaping our conduct with a view to the effect it will have on us. It is a very little business, when a man devotes himself to looking after his character. He will probably soon have none worth looking after. It does not come that way. But for him who simply tries to do the right, true, loving, unselfish thing, serving God and men faithfully, blessed character is formed without his thinking of it. It comes, and comes only, by always acting from principle; every movement of thought, feeling and ceaseless activity, then, like the flying shuttle, weaving threads of light and glory into the texture of our everlasting being. Or, changing the figure, this practice of virtue, in the action of all its holy laws, fixes, as sounds are marked and fixed in the speaking phonograph, the elements and registries of a true experience as a permanent acquisition, to abide ready for revelation again and for joy, so long as the fabric of our souls endure. By this making of divine principles a part of ourselves, our lives flow on richer and deeper, and we grow into real kinship with God.

3. Further, this is the only way of *safety.* No one observant of common experience, needs proof that perils, varied, thick and incessant, must be encountered by every man who goes forth into life. The hazards are appallingly great and multiform, to the view of every mind that seriously contemplates them. Failure and wreck, blasted hopes and ruined men are seen everywhere, sad memorials of the dangers of the way, emphasizing the ever needed caution: "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." How many barks that leave harbor with sails flying and steam driving, never come to their expected port. The mightiest steamers and the craziest shallops alike go down. These disasters usually occur from some want or violation of principle,

some deviation from the direction of the moral and spiritual truths of man's nature and God's world. There is a world of warning in this fact—that they come from attempts to run life, or some part of it, on policy, craft, intrigue, expediency, instead of righteousness. Often, they are from a single point of weakness or compromise—consent to yield in a single case, or mingle a single element of artful maneuvering with moral duty. One point of weakness or easy conscience in Judas let in the whole destruction. A single speck of rot may bring down an otherwise sound tree. A life that grows about a point of decay is never safe. The corruption spreads. The canker that sends to the grave is at first a little wart or pimple. But the roots strike out and the blood is tainted.

By swinging loosely to any vital law of right, men begin to be caught and drifted by treacherous currents into unlooked-for straits and on hidden rocks. By slight and occasional crookednesses, meshes are often strangely woven about the feet, until men find themselves mercilessly bound and cast out. Solomon, three thousand years ago, saw this great danger, and fixed the proverb that the snares of the unprincipled at last hold the schemer's own feet. It would be a long, sad list of troubles, failures, falls, or ruin, were we to go through the history of trifling with principle, from the days of Rebecca's white lies and shuffling for her favorite Jacob, down to these times when Fifth Avenue millionaires die in Blackwell Island Prison, or live on in Sing Sing; and foremost statesmen of the country are driven into dishonored retirement by the leprosy of Credit Mobilier corruptions or the complications of oblique stock-transactions. Even where unscrupulousness manages to keep its bark afloat, and a retributive public conscience fails to drive the hulk on dry dock, the breezes of success refuse to fill the sails. It is never safe climbing when the rounds you put into your ladder are rotten.

It is often said that he who tells one lie, will have to tell many, to hide or give effect to the first. This is a *general* law. He who once deviates from principle to the use of artful policy, will have the necessity on him of going into manifold expedients to complete his plans and save his ends.

The lines run out into endless complications. The intricacies resulting from one crookedness, sometimes necessitates torturing painstaking for years, till the danger is exhausted. Anxious engineering must occupy the soul day and night. We sometimes speak of the Christian's need of watchfulness, for his safety. And he must be on the alert. But *his* watching, in his trueness to conscience, is nothing compared with the hawk-eyed vigilance required of a man, who in scheming and sin is off the lines of right and duty fixed for safe guidance, or whom some sin has turned, like the Israelites at Kadesh, to wandering in a wilderness. One of the first signs of a man's being off the track, is his enforced painstaking to prevent the natural effects of his conduct, to conceal, avert, explain, rectify. While a life of principle, straightforward duty, is always self-explaining, shining in its own light, the effort to rub out the twists and give fair appearance to wiry ways, calls sure attention to the bad reality. Truth is the shortest and surest road in every difficulty. A large part of life's labor is in following crooked courses, and trying to make them appear straight. It more than doubles the labor.

"The integrity of the upright shall guide them." The most uncompromising principle, it is true, may not always save a man's temporal fortunes — *may* sometimes even endanger them, but not so likely as want of integrity. But should he apparently go under, lose place, riches, power, he is still gloriously safe. Wait till the clouds lift, and the false tides level out, and he will be found on a rock. The keen eye of even the heathen Socrates could not be confused by temporary adverse appearances, when he said to his judges: "This one truth, oh judges, you ought clearly to know, that for a good man there is no evil, whether he live or die." This was but the dawn of the full truth written by St. Paul: "All things work together for good to them that love God." What the steel rail, that guides the ringing train across the continent, is for the safety of the passengers, good principles are for the security of all the precious interests with which life is freighted. The mariner takes hold of the threads of light that come down from the great stars of the sky, and

directs his way across dangerous seas in triumph—so we hold on to the light-lines of the great principles of the moral world, beaming out of the firmament of God's word, and pass in security over the sea of life. It is no mystery. The reasons are plain; as these principles are the fixed, unchangeable laws ordained of Heaven for the right guidance of men to their true welfare. We often speak of the necessity of *strong* character, and of the steadiness this gives amid the misleading influences threatening men. Weakness is but another name for lack of principle. It opens one to all suggestions. It leaves him a reed to be shaken with the winds. But built in solid rectitude, a man's life has the grandeur of strength; and it is instructive to see how the spaces clear around him in blessed exemption from the importunities of evil. He is anchored to the eternities that God has made for his being. Truth, Justice, Honesty, Kindness, *are* eternities. They can never die. The stars of physical light may fade, the sun pale his glory, but these will be undimmed. Integrity, uprightness, love and piety, are imperishable. No combinations can destroy them: No grave ever entomb them. Principles have been put in prison; but they are freer than before. Enshrined in faithful hearts, they have been burned at the stake; but out of the ashes they have risen in purified glory and stronger witness. No sea can drown, no storm can sweep away, no abyss swallow up everlasting moral realities and laws. The man whose life is made and guided by them, is stronger than all earth's powers, safer than all earth's safeties. "Who is able to harm you if ye be followers of that which is good?"

4. Another consideration: *it is necessary to the work we have to do in our day.* Our lives have an office for others, to help save and lift up humanity. A useful life is a great glory. To be a blessing, should be among our highest aspirations. Every man, especially every educated man, should esteem it his precious privilege as well as sublimest consecration, to bear some worthy part in doing good and raising the race about him to higher planes. But no man's life can fulfill its mission of true usefulness without this strict, undeviating, transparent

following of principle. It is shorn of power to bless. It is itself, either wholly or in part, a blight. The good it may mean to do it cannot, the evil it does not mean it does. It throws out baneful lights, misleads and destroys. It is painful to see, what may be easily seen by looking at men in their various spheres, how much the usefulness of many is abridged or destroyed, by not holding themselves fully up to principle in their temper and conduct, as called for by their moral or Christian professions. Out of many little, out of some *no* virtue goes to heal and bless men, to rectify the evils of society, to strengthen life with virtue. The very suspicion of lack of integrity shears away ability to do good. Men in business if not always transparently genuine; lawyers, if inspired simply by Brougham's idea of their duty, 'only to get their clients clear;' ministers, if selfish seekers after place, popularity or ease, soft as wax to the shaping of passing pressures, can have but little leverage for elevating others or raising society. The world reaps little good from their being in it—will lose little when they leave it. The most brilliant talent, opulent learning, glowing zeal, will not suffice to give men, not staunchly true, any great beneficent power. The charm of consistency and confidence is wanting. The rod will not conjure in their hands. For true usefulness, power must breathe from the life, not as artificial odors from a censer, but streaming forth as a part of that life, like the unconscious fragrance of a flower. Men will give little heed to teachers whose views are impotent to regulate their own lives. Never imagine you can accomplish much good in the world by crafty expedients. In morals, as in geometry, a straight line is the shortest and surest between two points. But it is one of the beautiful and cheering things in the constitution of human relations, that even men of small talent and inferior equipments, if of earnest, loving nature and singled-eyed devotion to every law of duty, always serve their generation well.

It is remarkable how universally this relation of character to usefulness is acknowledged. We read in Epictetus of old: "A soul that dwells in virtue is like a perennial spring, pure,

limpid and refreshing. We hear the Chinese Confucius say: "Loyalty to principle is power." We meet the precept of Marcus Aurelius: "Be like the promontory against which the waves continually break, but which tames the fury of the waters around it." Such a life cannot be lived in vain. It will help truth and goodness into victory in the earth.

This is said to be an age in which moral ideas rule. Perhaps the claim is just, that, more than in some past centuries, they are in the ascendant. Our times do point to their sovereignty. There are counter drifts and eddying currents in the progress of the race, the confusions and retardations of depraved and resisting conditions; but the trend of the ages is toward their supremacy. The future of the world belongs to our moral Christian ideas. Any man who wishes to work with the movement which God, through the Gospel, is giving our race, and aid in making the world better, raising it to higher planes, must do his part by giving ascendancy, as far as he can, among men, to the rule of always acting from principle. This will also keep his own face turned toward sunrise, receiving always the first dawn and full morning of the blessed days that are coming on.

Many great questions, my young friends, are now waiting for solution—questions about man's origin, nature and destiny, questions of science and religion, social and political. But the first question for this age to settle, is the place it shall practically give to Christian principles. This—whether life shall be held under their control, or cankered and rotted by speculative doubts and want of regulative conscience—this will touch ten thousand interests where most of the simply intellectual problems will touch one. The settlement of this will go far to settle all others aright; because intellectual correctness waits so much on moral honesty and purity. Neither humanity nor individuals can safely postpone holy life to the slow solution of speculative difficulties and undetermined intellectual problems. A life walking in single-eyed loyalty to known present duty will have little trouble from the various enigmas of existence; and a true heart will do more for their settlement than the keenest intellectual di-

alectics. You will serve your day better by helping spiritual integrity with your lives than by any of your *mental* efforts to scatter the world's doubts and perplexities.

Young gentlemen, I have called your attention to this subject, in order to emphasize for you this great rule of duty. I know the subject is not new. But I know that it is for your lives what the older, underlying granite of the earth's crust, compacted by the fires, is for all the newer and superficial strata and soils and trees and life and beauty and glory that it carries. I do not suppose that you will have a severer ordeal than others, or will be more likely to come short and fail. But the ordeal is severe enough for every young man who passes through the gateway into active life. The crisis never thrills through his soul with too much nerving force. It is a time for you to adjust your chart and compass for the future. It is a time to gird up the loins of your Christian life, to put on the whole armor of God, and grasp anew the sword of the Spirit. I have felt that could you each be led, whatever you do, to make your life a life of fixed faith in principles, or rather in the God of principles, and firm, undeviating fealty to the doctrine of Christ, no matter what comes or how tried, you would be found, by men and Heaven, always true, happy, successful, going on to the perfection God has set for you.

The institution which is about to send you forth with its diploma, desires you to be safe and victorious. It trusts that the terrible lack of principle so plainly seen in many of the prevalent ways of life, in every sphere, may not harm you, or find any weak spot in your character for its destroying work, but that your lives may stand up in the pillared strength of righteousness.

We desire for each of you a useful life, one with the glory of being a blessing. You *can* be useful. In whatever sphere God sets you, if you are true to your work in the high sentiments we have indicated, a fresh contribution will be made to the forces whose increase the earth most needs. No matter how humble your position, how lowly your labors, how

circumscribed your sphere, such a life will breathe health and blessing all around. It will form light for others' footsteps. It will be strength for others to hold to. It will be victory in which others will share. The man who helps a single soul to grasp the principles of the doctrine of Christ, who reinforces their sway in a single heart, whose life quickens the force of duty in life about him, has added something to the elevations that move on into the future and raise the coming generations upward toward the altitudes for which the race is made. Young men, be assured you can do something worth living for.

I need not tell you that this will give you a *happy* life. I do not say you should seek happiness. It is not a thing to be set before your aim as an end. Yet happiness is so instinctively desired and really desirable, that you may properly take account of it in your prospective outlook. But without at all seeking happiness, your life will be full of it, if true to duty. You will have that ever-unremoved feast: "a clear and quiet conscience." Happiness attends right doing as the musical murmurs attend the flowing stream, or as the sweet songs of birds greet the vernal sunshine. All the principles of truth, goodness, love and purity, going into your nature, will form your very being as a well-tuned harp, which, however struck or touched, will vibrate with the blessed harmonies it holds forever. Every good deed that waits to be done, is happiness wanting to be tasted. Every character formed in righteousness is a thing of beauty which is a joy forever. You need not turn aside to seek happiness. It may then elude your grasp. If you are true to duty it will find you, and throw its bright mantle over you. If ever you are beguiled to wrong-doing you will find it a putting-on of a Nessus shirt that will eat as fire and tear the flesh before you are done with it.

Young men, the Church, the world, your country, society, everybody, will look, as they have a right, for superior virtue, wisdom, character and life from you—for greater strength of principle and consistency of conduct, than from others who have less education and knowledge. God is meaning to make

you standard-bearers for the cause of truth in the earth—is putting the colors into your hands to carry. It is by your doing not only well, but the best made possible by your advantages, that your part in life is to be rightly accomplished. Go forth to the noble life to which it has been sought, by the principles of Christ, to mould you. You bear with you the affectionate interest of your instructors, who feel bound to you by the ties of years of pleasant association. Though your connection, as students, with the institution is about to be dissolved, I trust your affectionate attachment to it as alumni will never cease, but strengthen with the lapse of years. If the link that binds us together is a kindredship of soul in feality to the principles of Christ, the tie will be an everliving, holy bond, and your future prosperity our common joy.

ARTICLE VII.

THE HISTORICAL WITNESS.

By Rev. Charles S. Albert, A. M., Carlisle, Pa.

Coleridge profoundly says that the Bible-message "finds us," answers the deep need of human hearts, satisfies their longings, and thus proves itself to us to be of God. There is no test of the reality and worth of Christ and the certainty of our faith so satisfying as that which comes by actual experience. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or, whether I speak of myself." John 7:17.

The Master asserts that His teachings will prove themselves. Along the pathway of obedience lie the assurances of faith. The truth and promises will verify themselves. The power which every believer gains over himself, the ever-increasing worth of righteousness, the acquisition of the Christian virtues, the profound confidence of acceptance by Christ, and therefore the Fatherhood of God, the utter renewal of the whole man so that all things become new, the direct answers to prayer, the providences of life, the fulfill-

ment of every promise to the believer recorded in God's word, so far as his life reaches them, all these are living evidences that he has put his trust in no cunningly devised fable, but in God.

We will concede that these assurances of faith have always somewhat of uncertainty in them, that they must rest upon faith as the ultimate. There will be times when all these may become shadowy, unsubstantial to many when they perchance may think that they deceived themselves, that they mistook the ordinary chances of life for divine providences. Mallock says, "a little reflection will show them that this must be so, and that faith, were it not so, would be robbed of half its value. Could the fact of God's existence, for instance, or the moral value of purity, be expressed by scientific proof—that is, could it be so proved that we had no choice but to believe it—our belief would lose that chastening and transforming power that, by those who feel it, it is supposed to have. An act of faith has the same effect on the character that an act of generous trust has. It is the only act by which the mind can be humbled in the presence of the sum of things, without being abased also; by which man can acknowledge the certain fact of his insignificance, without denying himself altogether any strength or dignity."

Our faith must rest in God's word, not on our religious feelings, not on our experience, not in answers to prayer; for, we shall find if we rest on these, doubt will come, and unless we regain the simple confidence in Christ's word, we shall soon drift into hypocrisy or skepticism.

In a former article contributed to the Review, Vol. VII. No. 3, we drew attention to the baneful influences of Individualism, which despises authority and the Past. It makes, in its extreme form, the individual the test of truth, and his experience, his feelings, the only trust-worthy indications of religious certainty. We, therefore, recall attention to the great fact of the historical proof of our Christianity as shown in the existence, power, and growth of the Church. Our opinions may change, our feeling fall swiftly from exaltation to the depths of doubts and despondency, but the Church which is the

body of Christ, filled with His fullness, remains ever, proclaiming Christ is Lord with all power in heaven and on earth.

We ought as wise men to grasp the whole truth and not a fragment of it. The Romish Church sacrifices the individual to the Church, the extreme sects of Protestantism sacrifice the Church to the individual. The truth comprises both, that there must be the Scriptures and the Church on the one side, as the immovable historical basis and ground of faith, and the testimony of the Spirit in the individual Chrsitian on the other. Romanism subordinates the individual to the Church, guaranteeing the faith, and thus becomes dead and formal, full of rottenness. Fanaticism dwelling on the testimony of the Spirit alone, without reference to the Church and its teachings, becomes visionary, separatistic, full of dangerous error, that at last leads on to the denial of Christ himself. "Many members of the Protestant Church have become weary of the abuses of freedom, of arbitrary interpretations of Scripture, of the numerous vague appeals to the Spirit, and are seized with a longing for some ecclesiastical guarantees, for a tradition possessing not merely relative, but absolute authority, in order thus to obtain rest." Hence perverts to Romanism. Let us therefore dwell upon the witness of the Church to the truth, and remember, when we demand individual experience, that it must be experience modified by the witness of the Scriptures and of the Church, which is the "pillar and ground of truth."

We shall find, too, that the consideration of the divine Church has its own weight with the unbeliever. It may not convince him, but it unsettles him and prepares the way for better things. It has been said, "you cannot bully a man into the love of God, nor even into belief of Him." When you, however, can call his attention to certain outstanding facts which have been produced by Christianity, you disturb his unbelief. We find that in common life. We assail a friend with arguments, it helps him but little; some fellow-man, however, lives evidently with God, carries the life of the Master wherever he goes, and thus religion be-

comes a clear reality to our friend, not so much from our arguments as from the great fact of pure Christ-like life. The Saviour appeals thus to His works, "believe me for the very work's sake." His works ceased not then, for He expressly affirms, "and greater works than these shall ye do; because I go unto the Father." These works are in the Church, so far as influence over others is concerned.

It ought to teach that "experience speeches and meetings" accomplish little. Outsiders cannot tell whether they are true or false, and probably set down these speeches as hypocritical, in which often they are not far from the truth; for men of deep experience are loth to bare their sacred emotions, whilst the shallow and the hypocrite are only too glad to seize the opportunity. Experience is such a comfort sometimes to an individual believer that he judges it must be so to others. A life of faith, which is embodied in act, disposition, in which there is an abiding sense of God's presence, has a greater influence over them. Therefore, dropping our intense individualism, let us recognize this truth also, that there is a historical proof of faith, and often turn to the witness of the Church, whose life is before every one and whose deepest facts are not hidden.

When "God was manifest in the flesh," He had "no form nor comeliness;" and when men saw Him, there was "no beauty that they should desire Him." It is repeated in the Church, for the Church as she appears upon the earth is often without beauty; but, as the thoughtful found in Christ the divine Son, so in the Church they will find Him again.

Passing by the Galilean peasant, the reputed son of Joseph the carpenter, His poverty and meekness, they found in His works and teachings the proof of His Messiahship. Passing by the poor garments, the surroundings, let us penetrate to the real Church and ask whence has she her power and greatness? The Church is the greatest fact in the world. No empire is as broad as her's, no organization controls multitudes as she does, no one has such power over her followers, and none is loved so intensely. What is the explanation and whence has the Church her life and power? A fact

like this must be met and explained. We have theories of nations, we trace their rise, progress, and we can agree on the sources of their power. We consent that all great movements must have an energy which explains their rise and development. There is no satisfactory explanation of the Church outside of an exalted and glorified Christ. The Church is His body, filled with His life.

1. We become familiar through time with great conceptions, and they lose their freshness and originality. The conception of the Christian Church was wonderful in its originality. It departed from all known religions when it sought to embrace the whole world with its teachings. Other religions had been satisfied with single nations. Jesus Christ of Nazareth declared His Church was for every land, for all nations, and would satisfy all people. He risked much, humanly speaking, when He proclaimed this, for He staked His divine claims upon the fulfillment that it should be suitable for every branch of the race, and thus every nation and every tongue that has accepted and is accepting the Christian religion is a proof of the divine character of the Founder.

The greatness of a man is shown when he rises above the low and prejudiced view, of his fellows, and proclaims the universal truths which are good for all time and places. One Church for all people was a conception unheard of before Christ. His divinity is seen in the thought. It was formed amid adverse circumstances. The most intense national church the world has ever seen was the Jewish. The Jew prided himself that he belonged to the covenant race, the people of the circumcision. The tidings of truth he had were good for all men, but the only method by which a Gentile could obtain them, was to relinquish his own nationality and become a Jew. There was even a great reluctance to preach the truths they possessed to the Gentiles. Jonah, a chosen prophet, divinely commanded to cry unto the Ninevites, has so great a dislike to the task that he attempts to run away from Jehovah. The struggles of the early Church, to rise to the magnitude of this conception, are too well known to be dwelt upon.

Whence had this man this magnificent conception? The only answer is: It was of God. This Church, therefore, claiming and securing every land, every tongue, is a witness that her Founder is God, and in her is salvation.

2. The simplicity of means witnesses that Christianity is divine. It is one thing to conceive a scheme, it is quite another to carry it into effect. World-wide kingdoms of an earthly character have been planned and attempted. They have flourished for a season and have won partial fulfillments, but all have failed because their means were insufficient. Apparently, they had the brightest prospects of success, their founders were men of great capacity, who left to their posterity strong armies, well-constructed schemes of government and great treasures. But the world-empires have all perished when they were yet far from their goal. Babylonian, Persian, Grecian, Roman, their names do but recall their fall. Humanly considered, the means which Christ relied upon to propagate His kingdom were very simple and, on their face, insufficient. The word and the sacraments. When we recall the strength of the word, it lies in His personality. The word is only powerful when it is joined with Christ. It is not His example, not His teaching, not His miracles, precious as they are, which appealed to the world, and conquered it, but His death and His resurrection, which are the power and wisdom of God. The living Christ is the power of His Church, and the simple word, the Gospel, is victorious through Him, and in no other conceivable way.

The sacraments also are great because of the presence of God in them. The existence of the sacrament of the Lord's supper is a wonderful proof of the divine power of Christ. All over the ancient world two ideas may be found in their religious worship: first, that man is a sinner, secondly, that he needs to propitiate the favor of God by sacrifice. The religions of the time of Christ led countless victims to the altar, blood flowed constantly, the priests needed strength more than wisdom, since to strike the bullock with fatal blow and draw the blood with sharp knife, were his chief tasks. After the proclamation of the Gospel all these passed away. It

was not because sin was esteemed more lightly, and unworthy of the notice of God, for conceptions of the nature of sin as held by the early Christians are much deeper, clearer than before, and they expose its hidden character as the ancient religions never dreamed of doing.

Nor was it on account of greed whereby they might rob God and benefit themselves, since a liberality, charity, and self-sacrifice marked the true Christian far beyond what was required for the purchase of sacrificial animals. Sacrifices were abolished, and in their stead the Lord's supper remained, as it typified that a sacrifice had been once offered for sin, which, divine in character, had atoned for sin forever, dispensing with the blood of bulls and goats. In this sacrament the early Christians testified that the broken body and shed blood was their sacrifice for sin, and, beyond the remembrance of their sacrifice, they obtained also grace and power through the eating and drinking. The Lord's supper abolishes sacrifice, because it rests on a divine sacrifice.

We are thus thrust back ever upon a divine Founder and a divine faith, for the word and the sacraments without the presence of a living Christ are by no means sufficient to have accomplished the mighty results, the great kingdom that fills the earth.

3. In the existence of the Church, there is an absolute confirmation of the divine character of Christ. He clearly states that His kingdom shall succeed, and that it shall never be overthrown. Some arguments are cumulative in their force. Every fulfillment adds to the conviction that they are true and will continue so until a new form of existence commences. A law is proven by its continued fulfillment, and after many repetitions we say it amounts to a demonstration. The sun we expect to see every morning in the east, with absolute certainty because it has always appeared there and nowhere else. More than eighteen centuries afford us a like cumulative proof that Christ is true and divine. Every passing year makes His word stronger and confirms His claims. We lose the individual miracles, to receive

in their stead, the continuous miracle, the Church. When He had but a few disciples, He said, "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Mat. 16: 18. That which He claimed the centuries have proven, and there is no cessation of the promise. It is remarkable that the first recorded utterances of Jesus of Nazareth manifest the ultimate success of His kingdom. When He was practically alone the victory was as assured as when He had gathered His disciples. The close of the sermon on the Mount looks forward to the day when His kingdom shall be known and recognized, when it shall be so desirable, that men who love Him not shall call Him Lord, Lord, when it will be to men's advantage and profit to assume His name; for the words Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? point on to days like our own, when the kingdom shall be great and so attract by its emoluments that many who are not His own will take upon themselves His name. Wherever we read His words we find this same calmness of success. There is neither hurry nor delay; there is neither hesitancy nor anxiety; there is neither a too willing acceptance of followers, nor a rejection of what may be weak in men's estimation. He builds as though He laid a foundation for eternity, and had all time to construct His kingdom; He rejects the wealthy, the learned, who will not yield to His claims; He pampers to no man; but He accepts the weakest and by them He conquers the world. The publican, the harlot, in His hands, are mightier than the philosophers and self-righteous of the earth.

A calm investigation of the past centuries will disclose that the same power is present. The Church often descends very low into corruption, and seems about to dissolve, but it ever reforms and purifies itself, and out of disaster rises more powerful than before. Whenever occasion demands, the reformers appear. They tarry not in the need of the Church. To-day the Church is stronger than ever. Eternal youth is hers, and though men may tremble when she is so fiercely

attacked as to-day, yet nothing is more significant of her strength than that she only uses part of her forces to repel the assaults they think so overwhelming, whilst her mightiest energies are put forth for the conversion of the world. Her missions and her preaching require more of her means and brains than her conflict with skepticism. Whilst men howl she is about to die, she is winning fair nations and other tongues.

All other religions are dying. The Church alone lives. Christianity has often grappled with many beliefs, and in the contests it has never been worsted. Whilst the Church has won one nation after another from other religions, she has never lost any except to Mohammedanism, which after all is but a corrupt form of Christianity. And it may be said with truth, had the Scriptures been a common possession in these countries in the hands of the people, read and studied by them as in Protestant lands, they would have kept the faith in far greater numbers. No land that has had the open Bible has ever been perverted from Christianity.

Ought not every man to see in these repeated fulfillments the absolute truth that the Church is of God, and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her?"

It seems to be the only satisfactory explanation. Her strength and success lie in the promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The Church is here not by sufferance, but by inherent strength. The contest has a novel appearance unless Christ divine be in her. We have on the one side an unlettered Gallilean, a peasant who attains a bare thirty-three years of life, a man without access to the stores of learning, unacquainted with the wisdom of sages and the systems of religions. He propounds, in the short compass of four books, a system of salvation based upon His own death and resurrection.

We have on the other side, stately religions, supported by prejudice and by interest. We have opposed to Him and to the Church then and ever since, the wise men of the earth, philosophers, logicians, wits. These ought certainly, with their culture and wisdom, disclose the weakness of His sys-

tem, and make manifest His delusion and His folly, until He becomes the laughing stock of the world. They should go further, and give men a system of religion and morality which should be so much better, that the world should not care for the worn-out scheme of Jesus of Nazareth. They have tried to do so. They have written against these teachings of Christ until the world is full of their books, but in spite of all their resistance, the Church has progressed, whilst they and their profound arguments and schemes have been buried in the dust of oblivion. Yet the strength of the Church is in Christ dying and atoning for the sins of the world, and then risen and glorified, wielding all power in heaven and on earth for His Church. The results prove to us that He is divine and that our faith is true.

4. We have moreover in the Church the testimony of an increasing line of witnesses. Men of the purest and most unblemished character, sound and careful in judgment, neither wild nor visionary, practical in all their doings, have asserted in every age of the Church, that they have enjoyed in the Church the divine favor, and that Christ has revealed Himself in the word and sacraments to them. We have no right to despise these men. They are known as careful thinkers, as cool, deliberate reasoners. They built up on the foundation Christ Jesus, and by the instrumentalities of the Church, characters which were near to perfection. They were of immense worth to their nation and times, sacrificing themselves for the welfare of their fellows, encouraging every scheme of good, repressing vice. Had it not been for them and their fellow-Christians, our learning, civilization, and morality would have been impossible. We know that hypocrites and liars cannot produce such results; strong characters for good are built upon strong convictions of right; falsehood in belief will produce falseness of life. Therefore, we have no right to reject their sober assertions for which they were willing to risk their lives. Their calm deliberate testimony has as much right to be heard as the witness of the mute stones and forces of nature. It must be accounted for, and not by us who believe with them, but by those who believe

not. They must assign satisfactory reasons why the best and purest have been led astray, and where the wonderful deceptive powers of the Church lie. They must know that our consciouness and experience are the basis of all knowledge, and that if you deny that the consciousness and experience of such men are trustworthy, then, the consciousness and experience of the human race are denied, and knowledge becomes a dream. John Ruskin says, "there is no great painter, no great workman in any art, but he sees more with a glance of a moment than he could learn by the labor of a thousand hours. God has made every man fit for his work; He has given to the man whom he means for a student, the reflective, logical, sequential faculties; and to the man whom He means for an artist, the perceptive, sensitive, retentive faculties. And neither of these men, so far from being able to do the other's work, can even comprehend the way in which it is done. The student has no understanding of the vision, nor the painter of the process; but chiefly the student has no idea of the colossal grasp of the true painter's vision and sensibility. The knowledge of all the laws of the planetary system, and of all the curves of the motion of projectiles, would never enable the man of science to draw a waterfall, or a wave; and all the members of Surgeon's Hall helping each other could not at this moment see, or represent, the natural movement of a human body in vigorous action, as a poor dyer's son, Tintoret, did two hundred years ago."

Let us take the obvious lesson. Because we cannot perceive the personal nearness of Christ, the testimony of these men that He was with them is not invalidated, no more than the painter's insight, by the want of it in the student. Their testimony is true, we are blind and cannot see.

Let us not forget then the historical basis of our faith, in times of despondency. Recall the Church as a fact which certifies the divine realities of our holy religion. The testimony of the Spirit in the individual Christian is satisfying, but it ought never to be taken out of its organic connection and reciprocal relation to the Scriptures and the Church. Then, and then alone, there will be a healthy Church and a steadfast personal piety, when these relations are preserved.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*The Life of our Lord Jesus Christ*, by C. C. Adams; *Sermons*, Doctrinal and Practical, by Morgan Dix; *Eventide at Bethel*, by J. R. Macduff; *The Comprehensive Church*, or Christian Unity and Ecclesiastical Union in the Protestant Episcopal Church, by T. H. Vail; *Through Bible Lands*, Notes of Travel in Egypt, the Desert, and Palestine, by Dr. Philip Schaff; *The History of the English Bible*, by W. F. Moulton; The Eleventh Vol. of *Lange's Commentary*, *Isaiah*, by Dr. Nägelsbach; *Sermons*, Doctrinal and Practical, by Rev. Wm. A. Butler, late Professor in the University of Dublin, edited by James A. Jerome, D. D., Professor of University of Cambridge, 2 vols.; *Studies of the Old Testament*, by Austin Phelps, D. D., Prof. of Andover Theological Seminary; *A Popular Commentary on the New Testament*, edited by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., in four vols., vol. I.

PHILOSOPHICAL AND SCIENTIFIC.—*Conscience*, with Preludes on Current Events, (Boston Monday Lectures), by Jos. Cook; *Outlines of Ontological Science*, or a Philosophy of Knowledge and of Being, by Henry N. Day; *Socialism*, by Roswell D. Hitchcock, D. D.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Modern Frenchmen*, Five Biographies, by Ph. Gilbert Hamerton; *A Short History of the French People*, (translated from the French), by Paul Lacombe; *The French Revolutionary Epoch*, a History of France from the beginning of the first French Revolution to the end of the Second Empire, by H. Van Laun; *The Life and Times of John Knox*, by C. K. True; *Modern England*, 1820—1874, (Epochs of Modern History), by Oscar Browning; *The Normans in Europe*, (Epochs of Modern Hist.), by A. H. Johnson; *An Account of the Life and Times of Francis Bacon*, extracted from the edition of his occasional writings, by Ja. Spedding, 2 vols.; *Landseer*, (Artist Biographies), by M. F. Sweester; *Leonardo da Vinci*, (Art. Biog.), by M. S. Sweester; *The Races of European Turkey*, their History, Condition, and Prospects, in three Parts, by Edson L. Clark, member of the American Oriental Society; *Hagenbach's History of the Reformation in Germany*, translated, (Clark's Foreign Theol. Library); *Lectures on Mediæval Church History*, by R. C. Trench; *History of the Christian Church*, during the first Ten Centuries, from its Foundation to the Full Establishment of the Holy Roman Empire and the Papal Power, by Philip Smith, B. A.

POETRY.—*Songs of Italy*, by Joaquin Miller; *Select Poems*, by Harvey Rice.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Recollections of Writers*, with Letters of Charles Lamb, Leigh Hunt, Douglass Jerrold, and Chas. Dickens, by C. Clarke and Mary Cowden; *Life and Adventure in Japan*, illustrated from original photographs, by E. Warren Clark; *The Europeans*, a Sketch, by H. James, Jr.; *American Colleges and the American Public*, (new edition), with Afterthoughts on College and School Education, by Noah Porter; *American Colleges*, the Students and Work, by C. F. Thwing; *Pointed Papers for the Christian Life*, by Dr. Theodore L. Cuyler; *Address and Orations of Rufus Choate*; *Oratory and Orators*, by Prof. W. Mathews.

GERMAN.

BIBLICAL.—The well known biblical scholar, Prof. Dr. J. P. Lange, has prepared a *Compend of Biblical Hermeneutics*, 114 pp. The book is the result of many years of study in biblical interpretation. The second edition of the same author's *Commentary on Genesis* has appeared. It is a revised edition, though the changes made are not very great. 476 pp.

The Gospel of John still receives more attention than any other book of the Bible, owing both to the nature of this Gospel and to the recent attacks made on it. Godet's *Commentary on John* has been translated from the French. Prof. Dr. Luthardt, of Leipzig, has revised and enlarged his Commentary, the second edition of which has appeared in two parts, 529 and 559 pp. The first volume of a *Commentary on John*, by the Catholic Bishop Hannberg, of Spires, is edited by Prof. Dr. P. Schegg. Besides a life of the deceased Bishop, the volume explains the first nine chapters of the Gospel. 642 pp. Lectures on *John and His Gospel*, by Dr. Duesterdieck, are also published. 66 pp.

The *Commentary on Second Corinthians*, by Prof. Dr. J. C. K. von Hofman (of Erlangen), has been revised, and a second edition appeared shortly before the author's death. 350 pp.

Dr. Möll's *Commentary on Hebrews* has also been thoroughly revised, and the third edition appeared in this case also a short time before the author's death. 198 pp. The volume is part of Lange's Bibelwerk.

Rev. C. Ernst is the author of a practical commentary on Ephesians, 119 pp., and also of one on the First Epistle of Peter, 175 pp. They are the result of exegetical lectures to his church, and are intended to promote the biblical knowledge of the laity.

HISTORICAL.—An important work in ecclesiastical history is that of Dr. E. L. T. Henke, on *Modern Church History*. The first volume, which treated of the Reformation and the Protestant Churches in the sixteenth century, appeared some time ago. The second volume is posthumous, and is edited by Dr. W. Gass. 496 pp. It contains the history of the Catholic Church and of the Lutheran and Reformed

Churches, till the middle of the eighteenth century. It is doubtful whether a third volume, bringing the history down to our time, will appear.

Rev. Dr. H. N. A. Jensen has published the third volume of his *Ecclesiastical History of Schleswig-Holstein.* 344 pp. It gives the history of the Reformation in these countries till 1580.

An important work is in process of publication in Switzerland. It is to give the documents of the history of the Swiss Reformation from 1521—1532. It is under the editorship of Dr. J. Strickler, who has charge of the archives of Switzerland. The first volume has appeared, containing the documents from 1524—1528. The whole work is to be in four volumes, and will contain four thousand documents.

The Financial System of the Popes, by Prof. Dr. P. Woker, is a contribution to the history of the Papacy, showing how the Popes collected money and for what purposes it was used. 225 pp.

Dr. C. Burk has published twelve lectures on the history of the Church in its transition from the Græco-Roman to the Germanic Period. 256 pp.

SYSTEMATIC.—In Biblical Dogmatics a new work has appeared by Rev. P. E. Haenchen. It is entitled, *The Doctrine of Salvation.* The author's aim is to give the biblical view of the Origin of Salvation, the Object of Salvation, the Plan of Salvation in God, the Accomplishment of Salvation through the divine means, the Appropriation, the Progress, and the Completion of Salvation. This volume, 396 pp., discusses the first three points; the rest are to be treated in a second volume.

The Doctrine of the Atonement, by Rev. G. Kreibig, 423 pp. The work is directed against the views advanced by Prof. Ritschl. It discusses the Necessity of the Atonement, the Act of the Atonement, and the Results of the Atonement.

Theological Ethics, by Prof. Dr. J. C. von Hofman, is a posthumous work, 350 pp. The book consists of lectures delivered in the University of Erlangen.

The principles of *Calvin's Ethics* are given by P. Lobstein, in a volume of 152 pp.

The Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, by Dr. Daniel Schenkel, 529 pp. The author is the well-known Heidelberg theologian and leader of liberal Protestantism. The book is intended to be popular and not merely for theologians. It is written from the standpoint of religious liberalism.

Dr. J. P. Lange has published a *Compend of Theological Encyclopædia*, 232 pp.

Modern Pessimism, by Dr. L. Golther, is a posthumous work, edited by Prof. F. T. Vischer, 224 pp. The author was a statesman, not a

theologian. His books are directed against the Pessimism of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann.

Darwinism, Religion, Morality, by Dr. G. P. Weygoldt, 153 pp., received the prize of the Hague Society for the defence of the Christian religion. The author discusses the nature of Darwinism, and shows its relation to religion and morality.

PRACTICAL.—Among the most valuable books in Practical Theology, which have recently appeared, are the works of the Lutheran theologian, Prof. Dr. von Zeschwitz. His works on Catechetics are very scholarly. His third volume on *Practical Theology* completes the series. It treats of the Care of Souls and of Church Government. The three volumes contain 718 pp.

The first volume of the *Practical Theology* of the Dutch theologian, Van Oosterzee, has been translated into German, 416 pp. The second volume is expected to appear soon.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.
For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version A. D. (1811), with Explanatory and Critical Commentary, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M. A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in ordinary to the Queen. New Testament. Vol. I. St. Matthew—St. Mark—St. Luke. pp. lxxii.; 472. 1878.

This is the first volume on the New Testament of what is familiarly known as the "Speaker's Commentary." The work on the Old Testament has been completed in six volumes; that of the New Testament will embrace four. This first volume on the New Testament has been prepared in the same general style with the preceding ones, but is of special interest and value. It contains the first three Gospels, usually styled the Synoptical Gospels, with an Introduction by the Archbishop of York. This Introduction covers all the leading questions of a general character which arise in regard to the Gospels, and treats of each separately. It is very full and satisfactory, and cannot fail of appreciation by critical scholars, and intelligent students in general. It would not be easy to find more valuable matter crowded into the same space. Some of his conclusions may fail to receive universal recognition, but his learning and sober judgment will command respect.

The notes have been prepared by different parties. The late Dean Mansel prepared the part on Matthew, chapters I—XXVI., and the editor, Canon F. C. Cook, that on the remaining chapters of Matthew, and the whole of Mark. The Bishop of St. David's, W. B. Jones, D. D., prepared the part on St. Luke, some years ago, and it has been revised and completed for the press by the present editor of the volume. These notes evince a full knowledge of the treasures of modern criticism, and a skill in their use. They are marked rather by a literary criticism of the letter of Scripture than by any deep insight in the spiritual meaning of the inspired word. There is nothing very original or suggestive in the comments. They are designed to explain difficulties and bring out the meaning of the text. The notes and comments are usually brief, and the volume is not cumbered with needless material.

Besides the running notes and comments, a number of topics, of a special character, receive a more extended treatment. Prominent among these is "the authenticity of the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel." The learned author, Canon Cook, says: "After a careful, and certainly a dispassionate, survey of the whole subject, we feel bound to express our entire concurrence in the opinion expressed by Dr. Scrivener, the first living scholar in questions of textual criticism, who 'defends the authority of this long and important passage, and that without the slightest misgiving.'" In this, it may be added, he is supported by other distingushed scholars.

Lange's Commentary. The prophet Isaiah. Theologically and Homiletically Expounded by Carl Wilhelm Eduard Nägelsbach, Doctor of Philosophy and Theology, and Pastor in Bayreuth. Translated from the German, with additions, by Rev. Samuel T. Lowrie, D. D., Philadelphia, and Rev. Dunlop Moore, D. D., New Brighton, Pa. pp. 741. 1878.

The part of "Lange's Commentary" on the New Testament was completed, in the American Edition, some time ago; and this volume on Isaiah leaves but one more volume to complete the part on the Old Testament. The remaining volume is on Numbers and Deuteronomy. The volume on Isaiah has been prepared with great care—the author having been engaged on it nine years. In translating and publishing it in English it was found necessary to condense and abridge the original German. The volume contains an Introduction of between twenty-five and thirty pages in which are discussed the CONTEMPORARY HISTORY; THE PERSON AND PROPHETIC LABORS OF ISAIAH; THE LITERARY PERFORMANCE AND THE BOOK OF THE PROPHET; AUTHENTICITY AND INTEGRITY OF THE BOOK, and LITERATURE. Against the objections which have been urged, the author maintains the authenticity and integrity of the whole book as the production of

the prophet Isaiah. To facilitate a comparison of the vocabulary of the so-called earlier and later prophecies, a list of words used is added at the end of the volume, covering twenty-five pages. The commentary is thoroughly critical in character, and will be regarded by critical scholars as a most valuable aid in the study of Isaiah. The author occupies the general position of those who look upon Isaiah as the great evangelical prophet of the Old Testament; and this learned commentary will help to strengthen the faith as well as to enlighten the minds of students of the divine word.

A Popular Commentary on the New Testament. By English and American Scholars of various Evangelical denominations. With Illustrations and Maps. Edited by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL, D., Baldwin Professor of Sacred Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New, York. In four volumes. Vol. I. Introduction, and the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. pp. XII.; 508. 1879.

This is still another COMMENTARY from the same house, and edited by Dr. Schaff. If the number and size of the commentaries on the Scriptures signify anything, this must be an age of Bible study. This volume, in size and general appearance, eclipses both of the preceding ones just noticed. The page is large, the paper and printing of a superior character, and the binding quite ornamental. A marked feature of the volume is the profuseness of illustrations and the number of maps and plans. Externally and internally the volume presents a most attractive appearance. From the embellishments it might pass for a holiday volume. But the contents are of a substantial character. There is first a GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT, treating of the name, origin, canon, character, organic arrangement, preservation of the text, of the New Testament, etc. Then Special Introductions to the Gospels. These are models of compact statements of the most important facts on the subjects treated. They do not pretend to be thorough and exhaustive discussions, but, as the name imports, for popular use. The text, with corrected critical readings, is printed in large type, in chapters and paragraphs, the verses marked on the margin. The notes are for the most part brief, and designed to explain or illustrate the text. There is little, if anything, that can be deemed superfluous. The material for the illustrations has been furnished by the Rev. Dr. W. M. Thomson, late of Beirout, Syria, and Dr. W. H. Thomson of New York, and the maps and plans are by Prof. Guyot, of Princeton. This Commentary on the New Testament will be completed in four volumes, and if the succeeding volumes are equal to this one, we predict for the work a high degree of popularity. We know of no single volume on the three Synoptical Gospels that furnishes more aid to a clear understanding of the meaning of the writers, or that throws more light on the geography, locali-

ties, manners and customs alluded to in the New Testament. The possessor of this volume may feel assured that he has a valuable treasure.

Discussions in Church Polity. From the Contributions to the "Princeton Review." By Charles Hodge, D. D. Selected and arranged by the Rev. William Durant, with a Preface by Archibald Alexander Hodge, D. D. pp. xi. 532. 1878.

When the venerable Dr. Hodge had completed his *Systematic Theology*, the desire and hope were expressed in different quarters, that he might give to the world the result of his studies and lectures on the *Church*. It was known that he had written and lectured extensively on this general subject, and it was believed that his varied learning and mature judgment would render such a work a blessing to the Church at large. This, however, he did not live to accomplish, and many felt it to be a matter of regret, that the Church had failed to receive this additional legacy from the distinguished divine of the Presbyterian Church. The present volume is intended, to some extent, to satisfy this desire and expectation. Dr. A. A. Hodge, in a brief Preface to this volume says, of his father: "After the publication of his *Systematic Theology*, he often expressed the desire that he might be permitted to complete that work by the addition of a fourth volume embracing the department of Ecclesiology; but was prevented by the infirmities incident to his advanced age." One of Dr. Hodge's pupils, Rev. William Durant, of Albany, N. Y., with the cordial approval of Dr. Hodge himself, undertook the task of making selections from the numerous discussions by him in the "Princeton Review," running over a period of a third of a century, on the Church and related topics. These selections have been carefully arranged so as to give the work a systematic character, and it has received the endorsement of Dr. A. A. Hodge, as a fair, and as far as the circumstances admit, an adequate exposition of his father's views, expressed in his own language, on all the subjects set forth in the table of contents.

It is not, therefore, an unwarranted liberty that this volume bears the title—*Church Polity—Hodge;* and we have no hesitation in pronouncing it a volume of great interest and value. The editing of it has been done with much care, so as to make it both convenient and pleasant to consult. Besides a carefully prepared table of Contents, there is a list of the selections from the "Princeton Review," in tabular form, with date, page, title, etc. To give the utmost completeness to the work, there is a model Index of twenty-four condensed pages. It is not often that we find so much care in editing a volume—but it is care well bestowed. The work is divided into two general parts: Part I. *Preliminary Principles*: Part II. *Application of Principles.* The genesis of the work and its contents give it a special valne to Presbyterians, but it contains much that will interest readers in all

Churches. Indeed there are few points involved in the nature of the Church, or the broad field of Ecclesiastical Polity, that is not touched upon with more or less fulness. Many of the questions which have been discussed for centuries in the Lutheran Church, and which are still under discussion, are treated in this volume. The views of so distinguished a scholar and thinker, on some of the points which continue to agitate the Lutheran Church, will be of interest to our readers. Dr. Hodge was known as a very conservative man and a staunch defender of the system of faith and polity of the Church to which he belonged. No one would think of questioning the genuineness of his Presbyterianism. And yet he was the very farthest from occupying in his own Church, in which he was an acknowledged authority and leader, the positions of those in the Lutheran Church who set up the claim of being the only sound Lutherans. We quote a few of his utterances. "The principle that the adoption of the Confession of Faith implies the adoption of all the propositions therein contained, is not only contrary to the plain, historical meaning of the words which the candidate is required to use, and to the mind of the Church in imposing a profession of faith, but the principle is impracticable. It cannot be carried out without working the certain and immediate ruin of the Church. * * * To adopt every proposition contained in the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, is more than the vast majority of our ministers either do or can do. To make them profess to do it, is a great sin. It hurts their conscience. It fosters a spirit of evasion and subterfuge. It teaches them to take creeds in a "non-natural sense." It at once vitiates and degrades. * * The over strict, the world over, are the least faithful. * * If the rule that no man should be allowed to exercise the ministry in our Church, who did not adopt every proposition contained in the Confession of Faith, should be carried out, we verily believe we should be left almost alone. We are not sure that we personally know a dozen ministers besides ourselves, who could stand the test. * * As we have no desire to sit thus solitary on the ruins of our noble Church, we enter a solemn protest against a principle which would work such desolation." pp. 330, 331, 332. Compared with such utterances from such a source, it is refreshing to hear men, some of whom are scarcely capable of reading the Lutheran Confessions, talk of unchurching as Lutherans all who do not receive these Confessions "in every statement of doctrine."

Dr. Hodge is equally pronounced on the subject of the communion at the Lord's table. "The Lord's table is for the Lord's people, and we commit a great sin, if we presume to debar any man, giving credible evidence of being a child of God, from our Christian fellowship. * * * Who are we, that we should refuse communion with those with whom Christ and the Holy Ghost commune? We devoutly

thank God that no such anti-Christian doctrine is countenanced by our Church. * * * There is a prevalent misconception on this subject, which ought to be corrected. It is said that by communing with any Church we recognize or sanction their errors. This is not so. If a Presbyterian commune in a Congregational or Episcopal Church, no man regards him as sanctioning their distinctive views of Church government. It is simply in their character of fellow Christians that he sits with them at the table of the Lord, to which they have a common right. And great is the guilt of those who refuse that right to any to whom it properly belong." pp, 218–223.

Although this volume has special interest and value for Presbyterians, a large part of it being taken up with the application of principles in their own history, yet it will be found of value to ministers and others in all Churches, whose business it is to be acquainted with the constitution and government of the Christian Church.

Gates into the Psalm-Country. By Marvin R. Vincent, D. D. Pastor of "the Church of the Covenant," New York. pp. IX.; 325. 1878.

The contents of this charming volume are eighteen lectures or sermons on so many Psalms or parts of Psalms. The quaint title suggests the rich variety and rare attractions which are opened to our view. The author has made the Psalms the subject of critical and loving study, and has here furnished his readers with some of the choicest fruits. Like the different parts of a beautiful garden, or the successive strains of sweet music, these discoures charm the soul and fill it with rapturous emotions. They are at the same time most helpful in the way of right living. They are full of the savor of genuine devotion and piety. It is a volume that we can commend for family reading and for the study of those who should seek to find out acceptable words in addressing their fellow men.

Epochs of Modern History. The Normans in Europe. By the Rev. A. H. Johnson, M. A. Late Fellow of All Souls College, etc. With Maps. pp. XX.; 273. 1878.

This is another volume of this admirable series of histories, which the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY has repeatedly commended. This volnme treats a portion of history of great interest, and, besides the historical details, is furnished with all the apparatus of Maps, Genealogical Tables, and Index, to make its use convenient and profitable. These volumes will do much to popularize the study of history.

The publishers, CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, are keeping up the standing of the house which had acquired so distinguished a reputation for publishing the most valuable works of a religious and theological character, as well as in other leading departments of science and literature. Their recent issues and those already announced give evidence

of enterprise, and a determination to advance in a career, which has made the house of SCRIBNERS illustrious throughout the world. They deserve well of a discerning public, as they have done and are doing so much to furnish the choicest productions of the ablest scholars both of this country and of the old world.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

[For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.]

The Ceramic Art. A Compendium of the History and Manufacture of Pottery and Porcelain, by Jennie J. Young. With 464 Illustrations. pp. 499. 1878.

The Ceramic Art has awakened no little attention, and called forth a number of volumes of no little interest in this department. The curiosity and desire to know more about it are very natural, and this volume will gratify any ordinary wishes in that direction. The author has furnished a volume that will both interest and instruct; and one is at a loss which most to admire, the comprehensiveness and completeness with which the subject is handled, or the minute details and ample illustrations setting before the eye pictures of the work through all the ages. It seems to leave nothing to be desired to acquaint us with "the history and manufacture of Pottery and Porcelain."

After a carefully written Introduction, setting forth the advantages of the study, itself worth an ordinary volume, Book I. is occupied with the discussion of "Nomenclature and Methods." But if any one imagines from these terms to find a dry discussion of mere technicalities he will be agreeably disappointed. For the several chapters in this Book discuss, in a very simple and attractive manner, not merely the use of terms, but the distinction in the various materials used and products resulting, including the composition of wares and glaze, and manufacture and decoration of the various styles. Book II. traces the history of this art in the Orient, from Egypt, through Assyria and Babylonia, Judea, India and Central Asia, Corea, Japan, and Persia, until, in Book III., we enter Europe. Here we have the fountains of European Art discussed, and thence we are carried through Greece, the Iberian Peninsula, Italy, France, Germany and Central Europe, Russia, Denmark and Scandinavia, to Great Britain and Ireland. Book IV. is occupied with the history of the art in America, and here we have South America, Central America, The Mound Builders, Indian Pottery, and the United States. A very full Index completes the volume. This brief notice of Contents will furnish no idea of their variety, or the interest that the reading of the work will create, or of the ample illustrations which crowd almost every page. The style in which the work is published makes it as attractive to the eye as its contents are to the inquisitive mind. It deserves a prominent place

among the holiday publications, as well as a permanent place in the well selected library of art and literature.

Illustrated History of Ancient Literature, Oriental and Classical. By John D. Quackenbos, A. M., M. D., author of "Illustrated School History of the World." Accompanied with Engravings and colored Maps. pp. 432. 1878.

The author of this volume aims to meet the want of a condensed text-book in the study of the History of Literature. It treats of the origin and relationships of different ancient languages, with their literature, illustrating the subjects by numerous examples and engravings. Following an Introduction of twenty pages, the work is divided into three parts, exhibiting respectively the "Ancient Oriental Literatures; Grecian Literature; and Roman Literature." Each of these parts or divisions has subdivisions, treating of the literature of particular peoples or periods. The whole is presented in a very clear and compact style. The work is well adapted either for private reading and study, or for the use of higher Schools and Colleges. Students of all classes will welcome it as a most convenient manual for their use in such studies.

English Men of Letters. Edited by John Morly.

Samuel Johnson, by Leslie Stephens. pp. 195.

Edward Gibbon, by James Cotton Morison, M. A., Lincoln College, Oxford. pp. 184.

Sir Walter Scott, by Richard H. Hutton. pp. 177.

Shelly, by John Addington Symonds. pp. 189.

This admirable series of *English Men of Letters* is rapidly progressing and must meet with popular favor. They are intended for the general Public, and to furnish enough to gratify the ordinary curiosity, and yet be brief enough to serve those whose leisure is scanty. Of the four volumes here presented, each is occupied with a subject of special interest, a representative man in his own department. The authors are men of reputation, and, being in sympathy with their subjects, the result is the production of volumes of no common-place compilation, but fresh and full of interest. They fill a manifest want in our literature.

Shakespeare's Comedy of Much Ado About Nothing. Edited with Notes, by William J. Rolfe, A. M., formerly Head Master of the High School, Cambridge, Mass. With Engravings. pp. 178. 1879.

This is the eleventh of Shakespeare's Plays which have been edited in this style by Dr. Rolfe. The Introduction, extended Notes and Index of Words and Phrases Explained, furnish all that any reader need care to have. The printing and whole make up of this volume are all that even the most fastidious can desire. It would be more than super-

fluous to commend Shakespeare—but these small editions of individual Plays may well be commended.

Stories from Virgil. By the Rev. Alfred J. Church, M. A., Head Master of King Edward's School, Retford, author of "Stories from Homer." pp. 255. 1879.

One of the twenty-five cent half hour Series, and full of interest about scenes in Virgil.

The Story of the Christians and Moors in Spain. By Charlotte M. Younge. 10 cts. in paper. This "Franklin Square Library" is a wonder of cheap reading.

HOUGHTON, OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.
Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.

The Æneid of Virgil. Translated into English Blank Verse. By Christopher Pearse Cranch. pp. XVII. ; 548. 1879.

This is in every respect a superb volume. The paper is heavy, the type large, open, and distinct, the margin wide, the binding attractive —a volume to feast the eye. The story of Virgil, pingo in æternum, is somewhat realized in the publication of his immortal poem in such style after the lapse of so many centuries. The Æneid still lives, and is read in different tongues. It has been repeatedly translated into English, and this is another attempt to furnish to English readers the real Æneid of Virgil. No previous translation has been very satisfactory. Dryden's rhymed one, probably the best known, besides not being very faithful to the original, failed to give the true spirit and style of the author. Conington's, of which we have only seen specimens, seems to be animated and tolerably close to the original, but too light and tripping in its movement for so grave and lengthy a poem as the Æneid. This version of Mr. Cranch has the chief merits of a good translation, and for the present must be the standard, taking rank along with Derby and Bryant's Homer. It is in the main faithful to the original, the style elegant and clear, the flow smooth and pleasant, and the whole impression made in reading it is agreeable. No translation into English can retain all the delightful harmony in sound and sense of the original, but this one, in the most approved measure for such a rendering into English, has preserved in a good degree the smooth flow as well as the sense of Virgil's polished numbers. The translator says: "I am far from pretending that my versification may not frequently fail to convey the movement of the Latin lines to the ear of those to whom they are familiar. What I have aimed at has been to render simply and concisely, without omission, addition, or periphrasis, and at the same time fluently, keeping in mind the best ideals of blank verse."

As a single specimen of the style we give the following familiar passage from Book I. near the beginning.

> Here, in a cavern vast, King Æolus
> Over the struggling winds and sounding storms
> His empire holds, and binds them fast in chains.
> They, chafing, with great mountain murmurs roar
> Around their cloisters. On his lofty seat
> Sits Æolus, with sceptre, and their wrath
> Assuages, and their fury moderates.
> Else would they bear away, with rapid force,
> Sea, earth, and heaven, and sweep them through the air.

Conington's translation of the same may be more sprightly, but it is less like Virgil, and, continued through the whole poem, will much sooner weary the reader. His reads thus:

> Here, Æolus, in cavern vast,
> With bolt and barrier fetters fast
> Rebellious storm and howling blast.
> They with the rock's reverberant roar
> Chafe blustering round their prison door;
> He, throned on high, the sceptre sways,
> Controls their moods, their wrath allays.
> Break but that sceptre, sea and land,
> And heaven's ethereal deep,
> Before them they would whirl like sand,
> And through the void air sweep.

The reader of Cranch's translation, if he does not get all the beauty and music of Virgil's great poem, will at least get a faithful transcript of the wonderful story, and presented in a simple and flowing style. With this translation of the Æneid, and Bryant's translation of Homer, the English reader is put in possession of the substantial treasures of these two great masters of Grecian and Roman song.

The Odyssey of Homer. Translated into English Blank Verse, by William Cullen Bryant. Two volumes in one. pp. x., 272; vi., 256. 1879.

Bryant's translation of the Iliad of Homer was noticed in the October number of this REVIEW, and it is unnecessary to repeat what was there said in regard to the general merits of the translation—for the same general features characterize both. The translator himself calls attention, in the Preface, to "the difference between the two poems." The Odyssey lacks "the fire and vehemence" of the Iliad, and the frequent sanguinary conflicts, which are so prominent in it. It is also marked by the scarcity of striking similes which so abound throughout the Iliad, and which is one great source of its beauty and charming attractiveness. In the Iliad the imagination is kept in a glow by the constant presentation of beautiful pictures; in the Odyssey our interest is sustained by the variety and constant change in the progress of the story of the man, who,

"wandered far and visited
The capitals of many nations, learned
The customs of their dwellers, and endured
Great sufferings on the deep.

It is needless to commend the Odyssey to our readers. As a rule, we do not commend translations to students, but we believe that a judicious use of such translations as Bryant's Homer and Cranch's Æneid would greatly aid them in obtaining a clear view of the scope and design of the writers, as well as help them to appreciate the beauty and force of their productions, without hindering a careful study of the original. No one whose duty it is, or who has the ability, should fail to read these poems, unmarred by any defects of translation, but those who are not thus privileged may enjoy much of the pleasure and benefit from these faithful and admirable translations. For ourselves, having read and admired them in the original, we are glad to have them in this English dress, and commend them to our readers. The publishers have furnished them in a style worthy of the most celebrated productions of the most celebrated poets of classical antiquity.

Visions: A Study of False Sight (Pseudopia). By Edward H. Clarke, M. D. With an Introduction and Memorial Sketch, by Oliver Wendell Holmes, M. D. pp. xxii.; 315. 1878.

This is, in many respect, a very interesting volume. The Introduction and Memorial Sketch, by Dr. Holmes, are appreciative and tender—the tribute of a devoted friend. Dr. Clark had attained a distinguished eminence in his profession, and as a writer. The contents of the volume relate to subjects of importance and interest to all thoughtful minds—the phenomena of false visions. It is designed to furnish some rational explanation for much that has seemed to partake of the supernatural. Dr. Clarke does not discard the supernatural—he is no materialist—but he seeks to elucidate many of the phenomena of strange seeing, without the aid of any special spiritual agency. There are some very touching as well as very remarkable scenes described. Some portions of the volume cannot be read without feeling that we are touching on the border line between this and another world.

Boston Monday Lectures. Consciene, with Preludes on Current Events. By Joseph Cook. pp. 278. 1879.

We welcome this fourth volume of Mr. Cook's Lecture's. They deserve to be preserved and widely circulated in this permanent form. Whatever criticisms may be made of Mr. Cook's oratorical characteristics, and of some of the arguments used by him, it must be conceded that in their substance and main lines of reasoning, the lectures form an able and effective defence of fundamental ethical and Christian

truth. While the lecturer's brilliant imagination and impetuous rhetoric sometimes interfere with philosophical accuracy, they serve to set forth the great truths maintained in unusually transparent and impressive clearness. His chief forte is in exposing the noisy shallowness and sophistries of the skepticism and materialism of the day.

The object of the lectures of this volume is to vindicate the authority of conscience, with its theistic implications, against the positions of false science and the agnosticism of Matthew Arnold and others. The scope of the discussion is best indicated by presenting the table of contents: "Unexplored Remainders in Conscience; Solar Self-Culture; The Physical Tangibleness of the Moral Law; Matthew Arnold's View of Conscience; Organic Instincts of Conscience; The First Cause Personal; Is Conscience Infallible? Conscience as the Foundation of the Religion of Science; The Laughter of the Soul at Itself; Shakespeare on Conscience. As to its essential nature, Mr. Cook represents Conscience as including in its action "a direct perception of right and wrong" and a "feeling that right ought and wrong ought not to be performed." In thus making Conscience fundamentally intellectual, and recognizing the INSTINCTIVE character of its action, Mr. Cook has taken the ground on which psychology compels sound thinking to stand, and which opens a clear way to the theistic and moral conclusions he so strongly presents. We are compelled, however, to dissent from the limitation he puts on the function of Conscience, when he restricts its perceptions to INTENTIONS and CHOICES, or to the sphere of the soul's MOTIVES alone, and denies to external acts, apart from motives, all moral quality of rightness or wrongness, leaving them nothing but "expediency or inexpediency, usefulness or harmfulness." He adopts this limitation in order to claim infallibility for the conscience, but we believe he loses more than he gains by it. Without at all helping the claim of infallibility, it leaves a view of conscience that utterly fails to meet and satisfy the full facts in the action of man's moral nature. The distinction "between what conscience includes and what it implies," which Mr. Cook claims as a "novel point" in his description, cannot be used to cover the defect. An ethical system will be found to break down at every step, if built up on so partial and inadequate a recognition of the primary data of the moral faculty.

Did our space allow we would like to indicate difficulties in some other positions taken in these lectures. But it is unnecessary. After all just criticisms are made, they will be found to contain enough of great truth boldly asserted, impressively vindicated against aggressive error, to make them worthy of wide circulation and careful study by all who wish to be abreast with the best thought of the times.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

Outlines of Theology. Rewritten and Enlarged. By Archibald Alexander Hodge, D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. pp. 678. 1879.

The first edition of this work, prepared nearly twenty years ago, met with marked favor, and was translated into different languages. The author's subsequent experience, as professor in a Theological Seminary, engaged in imparting full and systematic instruction in Theology, has led to an enlargement of the work, and to some important changes and improvements. These changes and improvements are thus described in the Preface: "The new edition contains nearly fifty per cent. more matter than the former one. Two chapters have been dropped, and five new ones have been added. Extracts from the principal Confessions, Creeds, and classical theological writers of the great historical Churches have been appended to the discussions of the doctrines concerning which the Church is divided. Several chapters have been entirely rewritten, and many others have been materially recast and enlarged. And the Appendix contains a translation of the Consensus Tigurinus of Calvin, and of the Formula Consensus Helvetica of Heidegger and Turretin."

We know of no work of the kind so well adapted for the purpose of students of the Reformed Church. A very large part of the work is undenominational, and will be acceptable to students and ministers of any orthodox Church; but Dr. Hodge makes no secret of his doctrinal position, and his Calvinism is not diluted to suit weak stomachs. We respect him for his firm maintenance of what he believes to be the truth, yet this does not blind our eyes to what we regard as serious errors in viewing and expounding the plan of redemption. Abating the doctrinal points on which we must dissent from the views of our author, we regard the volume as an admirable outline or compend of Systematic Theology. It is methodical in arrangement, clear in statement, concise in definitions, logical and scriptural in its proofs. It aims to meet the wants of students at the present day, both in the direction of scientific objections to religion, and in the desire for acquaintance with the views of different Churches as set forth in their Creeds or Symbols. We deem it unnecessary to criticise particular points on which we should dissent from the author. It is enough to say, that it exhibits and defends the old historic faith of the Reformed Church, but does it in a liberal and candid spirit; and that the work is marked by such qualities as will make it, in a high degree, acceptable and useful. As the work of a wise master-builder, although we think some "hay and stubble" have been mixed in the material, the "gold, silver, and precious stones" are sufficient to make it "abide," and prove a permanent blessing to the Church.

Theological Lectures on subjects connected with Natural Theology, Evidences of Christianity, The Canon and Inspiration of Scripture. By the late William Cunningham, D. D., Principal and Professor of Church History, New College, Edinburgh. pp. xiv. ; 625. 1878.

This volume is very different, in nearly every respect, from the preceding one just noticed. Instead of being carefully revised, it is posthumous, and instead of being systematic and comprehensive it is rather fragmentary and partial. It must be judged by what it is intended to be, and not by what it is not intended to be. It is not intended to be a system of Theology, but simply Lectures on subjects connected with Theology. Dr. Cunningham was one of the great lights of the Free Church of Scotland. After the disruption he visited this country, and his eloquence and zeal in behalf of his suffering Church at home are still remembered. He is the author of several works, collected and published after his death. "The Reformers, and The Theology of the Reformation; Discussions of Church Principles; Historical Theology," have given him a wide reputation as a Theologian and author. The present volume is the last of these posthumous volumes, and it is given to the public at the urgent request of many admiring friends. These Lectures are on Natural Theology, Christian Evidences, Canon and Inspiration of Scripture, etc. They are marked by vigor of thought and style, intense earnestness and zeal in the cause of divine truth. The volume throughout bears evidence of the age and surroundings, but there is a great deal of substantial truth that will pass current at all times. The value of the volume is not so much in the amount of knowledge communicated or for its learned discussions, or for the earnestness with which it expresses great fundamental and practical truths in the study of Theology. If in some points we cannot agree with the author, or think his discussion not such as this generation needs, in others we give him all honor for the manner in which he continually urges the great doctrines that concern God, and the soul, and immortality. His Lectures are aglow with spiritual fervor—an ardor that seems like a divine inspiration. We could wish nothing better for the great body of our Theological students at the present day, than that they would read and follow the advice so impressively given in some of the earlier lectures, and enforced on every suitable occasion throughout the volume. The lack of anything in the shape of an Index is a very serious defect in so large a volume.

History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin. By the Rev. J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, D. D. Vol. viii. pp. 464. 1879.

It is needless to say anything about the general character of D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation. This volume completes the work. Besides the interest common to the Reformation, and to this history

of it, this volume has some particulars of special interest. A large amount of space is devoted to the Reformation in England; it contains a fac-simile of the famous Indulgence issued by Pope Leo X., the sale of which by Tetzel in 1517, so roused the indignation of Luther, and called forth the famous Ninety-five Theses. Readers will be glad to have a sight of this document. There is, also, a General Index to the eight volumes of this series—the Reformation in the time of Calvin. This Index covers nearly one hundred pages. In spite of some serious defects, and notwithstanding some severe criticisms, D'Aubigne will continue to be read by admiring thousands.

Home Lessons on the old Paths; or Conversations on the Shorter Catechism. By M. T. S. pp. 400. 1879.

The title of this little volume indicates its general character. But its real value can only be realized by a careful reading or study. It is admirably adapted for family use, and a Christian parent who uses it will hardly fail in interesting and instructing children. It contains more precious truths than a score of volumes of the same size such as are too common in Sunday Schools and Christian families. The great fundamental truths of Christianity are presented in a very easy and attractive manner. It deserves a wide circulation and use.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON, MASS.

[For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.]

Rock of Ages. By Augustus Montague Toplady. With Designs by Miss L. B. Humphrey. Engraved by John Andrew and Son. 1879.

Lee and Shepard publish each year some favorite hymn beautifully illustrated. This year, Toplady's "Rock of Ages" has been selected. Few hymns in our language are better known or more highly prized. The artists and publishers have done their best to add to the popularity and effectiveness of this hymn. It deserves a place among the choicest household Christian treasures. This is the fourth of what may be styled spiritual gems illustrated.

Wordsworth. A Biographical Æsthetic Study. By George H. Calvert. pp. 232. 1878.

This is a charming volume. As a study of Wordsworth it has been admirably planned, and as admirably accomplished. It is not meant as a biography; but the critical discussions of the poet's development and writings have been arranged upon a biographical outline, and connected with successive incidents and experiences in his history, from his first school-days at Hawkshead until the time of his death in 1850. Wordsworth's literary and poetic development is thus delightfully traced in the various stages of his success, till he ended his high career as one of England's most admired poets. As a critic Mr. Calvert shows clear analytic insight, sound judgment and

fine taste. He commands a style at once vigorous and capable of expressing the most delicate shades of thought. He has entered into the very heart of Wordsworth's poetry, and sympathizes with the profound and tender spirituality of conception which constitutes its most distinguishing characteristic. In his free sketchy way, he has caused the intellectual and poetic personality of the author he studies to stand forth with rare distinctness. His judgment of Wordsworth is: "He was a man to admire, to rejoice in, to revere, a good man and a great man, standing in the splendid hierarchy of English poets next to Milton, possibly by his side." We commend this volume as of high critical excellence. It will help to make Wordsworth more valued among us, and increase Mr. Calvert's own literary reputation.

The Unity of the New Testament. A Synopsis of the First Three Gospels and the Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, St. Peter, St. Paul, to which is added a Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. By Frederick Denison Maurice, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. First American Edition. pp. 538. 1879.

Mr. Maurice, the author of the lectures which form this volume, died in London, 1872. He was born in 1805, educated at Cambridge and Oxford, entered the ministry of the Church of England, and occupied positions of high prominence and great influence. He gained great celebrity by his numerous writings and his earnest zeal in the cause of social reform. He was a man of much originality and independence, caring little for customary boundary lines of thought, and developing some peculiarities of doctrine unacceptable to conservative orthodox theology. He belonged to the school of thinking which received its special foundation from Dr. Arnold, and may be properly classed with Robertson, the brothers Hare, Tennyson, and Charles Kingsley.

The work before us, appearing as the "first American edition," consists of lectures delivered by Mr. Maurice on the Foundation of Bishop Warburton. There are six lectures; the first three on the "Subjects common to the three Evangelists;" "Difference of the Evangelists;" "Acts of the Apostles, Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, St. Peter, and St. Paul," and three on "The Epistle to the Hebrews," under the headings "How the New Testament fulfils the Old," "The Divine Education of the Jews," and "The Filial Dispensation." The design is to vindicate the divine character of Christianity by showing the unity of the Scriptures as a continuous and self-consistent exhibition of Jesus Christ as the Son of God establishing a spiritual kingdom of God on earth, in the souls of men. He endeavors to bring this side of the divine purpose into clearer relief and prominence than he regards common theology and exegesis as doing. Without denying the sacrificial

work of Christ, he seeks to emphasize the divine intention to secure, through that self-sacrifice, the sacrifice of the human will everywhere to the love and will of God in the kingdom of grace.

We are glad to see this "American Memorial Edition" of this work. It is full of rich, suggestive, quickening, and productive thought, and of truths that ought to have the stress the author here gives them. The publishers' work has been most tastefully done, and the volume is one to be desired for the library.

Pizarro. His adventures and Conquests. By George M. Towle, author of Vasco Da Gama. pp. 327. 1879.

This is the second volume in the series of "Heroes of History" begun by the author in "Vasco Da Gama." The wonderful career of Pizarro furnishes abundant and varied material for the author's graphic narration. Mr. Towle traces him from his early home in Spain, through all his adventurous life and bold ambitions, his voyages, his invasion and conquest of Peru, his marvelous experiences and ultimate fate in the "land of the Incas." The story is more exciting than fiction, and will help the young to a clear view of the historical events that laid the foundations of Spanish dominion in South America.

Select Poems. By Harvey Rice. pp. 174. 1878.

Among the sixty-four poems which form this volume, here and there is found one of some degree of merit. But the book will not establish Mr. Rice's reputation as a poet.

Mother-Play, And Nursery Songs. Illustrated by Fifty Engravings. With Notes to Mothers. By Friedrich Froebel. Translated from the German. pp. 192. 1879.

This volume, by the founder of the Kindergarten System, translated into English, is emphatically a household volume—a volume for mothers to study and use in the care and training of their little ones. It is well calculated to impress the beauty, tenderness. and loveliness of infancy developing into childhood and youth, and the high vocation and responsibility of mothers. The numerous illustrations of infancy and childhood, the songs to suit, and the explanations of the plates or designs, make it a volume full of touching, playful interest and valuable instruction. It recognizes the relations of life not alone as human, but divine and having their source in God.

Live Boys; or Charley and Nasho in Texas. A narrative relating to two boys of fourteen, one a Texan, the other a Mexican; showing life on the great Texas Cattle trail, and their adventures in the Indian Territory, Kansas, and Northern Texas; embracing many thrilling adventures. Taken down from Charley's narrative by Arthur Morecamp. Illustrated. pp. 308. 1879.

A story for boys, full of interest from exciting scenes and strange adventures.

Burying the Hatchet; or, the Young Brave of the Delawares. By Elijah Kellogg, Author of "Elm Island Stories," etc., etc. Illustrated. pp. 336. 1879.

This story exhibits the hardships and dangers of early frontier life. Designed for boys, it is well calculated to excite and interest by its wild and thrilling narratives, and which had a sufficient basis of truth to make such experience real.

Flaxie Frizzle Stories. Little Pitchers. By Sophie May, author of "Little Prudy Stories," etc., etc. pp. 196. 1879.

This is the third volume of "Flaxie Frizzle Stories," and which are favorites with the young. They please, and develop the better traits of character.

LEE AND SHEPARD are deservedly popular with young readers, as they are doing so much to afford them amusement and instruction.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

The Atonement Viewed as Assumed Divine Responsibility; traced as The fact attested in Divine Revelation; shown to be The Truth Uniting Christian Theories; and recognized as the grace realized in Human Experience. By G. W. Samson, formerly of Washington, D. C.; now of New York. pp. 331. 1878.

The title of this volume is quite ponderous, and it contains much substantial truth and solid argument. It purports to put forth a new view or new philosophy of the atonement. This is couched in the expression—ASSUMED DIVINE RESPONSIBILITY. So far as there is anything really new, we have not been able to discover any new light thrown upon this mysterious but central doctrine of Christianity. So far as Dr. Samson holds to the essentials of the doctrine as commonly held, we are at one with him; but in some of his interpretations of scriptural terms, as well as some of his reasonings, we hesitate to follow. The statements and arguments are in general so brief that it would require a volume of equal size to review it satisfactorily, and for this we have not space at present. It is a volume for thoughtful students, who would fathom the mysteries into which the angels desire to look. Reverent in spirit, earnest in manner, vigorous in style, we commend the volume to such as can profit by its reading.

GEORGE W. FREDERICK, PHILADELPHIA.

Recreation Songs. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. pp. 37. 1878.

The friends of Dr. Seiss, who know him only as an eloquent preacher, will be surprised at this volume of songs from him. The title indicates that they are the productions of leisure hours. They are only nine in number and not very long. Whilst they are quite equal to much more that is published as Song and Poetry, we think that Dr. Seiss' reputation will have to rest on his prose compositions. He has not wooed the Muse with sufficient ardor to gain her tenderest or lofti-

est inspiration. But, if not the highest style of poetry, these Songs will be read with pleasure, and the religious sentiment is good. The volume is published in the most attractive style, suitable for a holiday present, and Dr. Seiss may well congratulate himself on the setting his Songs have received.

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Sermons. By the Rev. Phillips Brooks, Rector of Trinity Church, Boston. pp. VII.; 371. 1878.

The "Lectures on Preaching" by Rev. Phillips Brooks prepared his readers to welcome a volume of sermons from the same pen. The author has won a reputation as one of the most popular preachers of the day—and popular in the best sense, because there is nothing sensational or ephemeral about his productions.

The present volume contains twenty sermons, on a variety of interesting and important subjects. It is not a very easy matter to state in a few sentences in what the attraction and power of these Sermons consist. That they have such attraction and power every intelligent reader must feel. It is not the finish or grace of composition, or splendid rhetoric, or impassioned appeal, although these Sermons are not deficient in literary merit. There is something better than any or all of these qualities, and which leads us to forget the preacher and his style in his subject. Our attention is at once fixed upon the subject under discussion, and in what seems the most direct and simple manner, the truth is set before the mind, and carried home to the heart and conscience and life with unaffected earnestness and with singular power of illustration. Hearers are led to see themselves in the light of divine truth. It shines around them and penetrates the innermost recesses of the heart. Our author posseses a wonderful power of translating divine truth into present living forms. There is a singular absence of everything that savors of mere technicality or formalism in preaching, or of cant or affectation in piety. But on the other hand, a transparent frankness and a manly utterance of the truth, that commend the preacher and his messages to all open and candid minds. One feels that he is not dealing with mere barren abstractions, or fancied sentimentalities, but with eternal living truths, and immortal beings. It is a sharp bringing together of the human soul and divine truth, translated into the living speech of to-day. It is the close contact of the word of truth with the heart of man, in all its varied movements. Hence they are full of consolation, of solemn admonition, of tender entreaty, and of inspiring hope. Religion is treated as a "reasonable service," and one is made to feel that it is not merely a set of doctrines or round of ceremonies, but a thing of life and power, the one thing needful for man. In a word, these discourses are fresh, instinct with the living energy of divine truth, and applicable to the varied experiences of the human heart and life.

NELSON & PHILLIPS, NEW YORK.

Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures. Vol. I. of the Library. By Henry M. Harman, D. D., Professor of Ancient Languages and Literature in Dickinson College. pp. 738. 1878.

This is the first volume of the "Library of Theological and Biblical Literature," issued under the supervision of Drs. Crooks and Hurst of the Methodist Church. The Series will comprise twelve volumes, by distinguished scholars of that denomination. The plan is comprehensive, and if well carried out, will furnish a compendious apparatus for study of great value. It argues well for that Church that it is making such progress in the work of Theological Science.

The volume before us makes, in every way, a very favorable impression. It is substantial in bulk and contents—embracing 738 pages crowded with valuable matter. We have not time or space, in this number, for an extended critical review; but the work bears evidence throughout of having been prepared with care, and with a judicious use of many of the latest and best authorities on the various topics treated. The plan of the work is very simple, the Contents being divided into chapters of which fifty-two are devoted to the Old and forty-one to the New Testament. Many of the subjects are necessarily treated with great brevity, and yet scarcely anything belonging to such an "Introduction to the study of the Holy Scriptures" is overlooked. In the part on the Old Testament, besides a brief discussion of each separate book, the author discusses the subjects of Divine Revelation; The Canon of the Old Testament; The Hebrew and its Cognate Tongues: The Condition of the Text of the Old Testament; Ancient Versions; Genuineness of the Pentateuch; Antiquity of the Art of Alphabetical Writing among the Hebrews, etc., etc. More than one hundred and fifty pages of the work are devoted to the Pentateuch—perhaps a disproportionate amount of space—yet its fundamental charaeter may justify the prominence given to it. The part on the New Testament, in like manner, besides a brief discussion of each book separately, treats of the connection of the New Testament with the Old; The rapid diffusion of Christianity; Diffusion of the Greek Language in the Roman Empire at the Christian Epoch; Character of the Greek of the New Testament; The Canon of the New Testament, etc., etc. The volume is also furnished with a full Index of Topics and another of the Authors quoted.

The partial examination we have been able to give the volume leads us to regard it as one of more than ordinary value. The author has evidently gleaned from a wide field, and here presents his readers with the rich, ripe grain he has gathered. It would be too much to expect that no grains of chaff would remain, or that all the valuable wheat would be gathered into one single repository; yet that Dr. Harman

has done his work carefully and well, no one can doubt who examines this volume. It will not dispense with the need of more full and thorough discussions of single points, but it will supply what is proposed—a convenient and commodious manual for the use of ministers and laymen as an Introduction to the study of the Holy Scriptures.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, NEW YORK & PHILADELPHIA.
For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Through Bible Lands: Notes of Travel in Egypt, The Desert, and Palestine, by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Biblical Learning in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. pp. 413.

This volume, just published, is from the pen of one of our most distinguished biblical scholars. A severe domestic affliction led to this foreign travel, and the result is this volume. It is not designed to be a learned treatise, but a popular presentation of what the author saw and learned during his travels in the East, embracing Egypt, the Sinaitic Peninsula, and the Holy Land. It is written in an easy, matter-of-fact style, and is supplied with Maps and Illustrations. It will be found very readable and instructive. The Maps and Illustrations add to the value of the volume, and the Index makes it convenient to consult on individual topics as may be desired.

Life and Adventures in Japan. Illustrated from Original Photographs. By E. Warren Clark. pp. 247.

Mr. Clark spent four years in Japan, employed by the government as a teacher of science, first at the city of the exiled Tycoon, and afterward as Professor of Chemistry in the Imperial College in Tokio. This gave him every opportunity to understand the strange people of that wonderful country. He has here presented a narrative of his experiences and adventures, reflecting vividly the singular character and customs of Japanese life. His style is charming. The illustrations are numerous and good. It is a capital little book, and old as well as young people will enjoy it greatly.

Guiding Lights: Lives of the Great and Good. By F. E. Cook. pp. 232.

This is just the kind of book to interest the young in biographical reading. It contains short, lively histories of the lives of Michael Angelo, Madame Guyon, Martin Luther, and Frederick Perthes. They are indeed 'guiding lights.' Let such books as this go into Sunday School Libraries.

MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON AND NEW YORK.

Life of John Eadie, D. D., LL. D. By James Brown, D. D., author of the "Life of a Scottish Probationer." Second Edition. pp. xv.; 405. 1878.

Dr. Eadie, born May 9th, 1810, died June 3d, 1876, was one of Scot-

land's most eminent Biblical Scholars. He was laborious as a pastor, a professor, and an author. His life was one of continued activity. This volume, by his friend Dr. Brown, traces his life from his boyhood, through its successive periods, until its close, furnishing such details in various departments of labor, and such personal characteristics and incidents, as to make it one of interest to the scholar and the Christian. His various works will be a lasting monument to his industry and learning. Such a life is one of the best defences of and strongest arguments for Christianity. The volume will find its place among the lives of the great and good men which adorn the Church and bless the world.

ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & CO., NEW YORK.

Socialism. By Roswell D. Hitchcock, D. D. pp. 111. 1879.

This small and very neat volume, on a vital subject of the age, cannot be too highly commended. Nowhere in so narrow a compass can the reader find so clear an exhibition of *Socialism*. Under the divisions: Socialism in General; Communistic Socialism; Anti-Communistic Socialism; Christian Socialism; we have an array of facts, and a vigor of logic and rhetoric, that carry conviction to the mind of the reader. It should be widely circulated, and its contents earnestly pondered. It is a most timely utterance by one who weighs his thoughts and words, so that what he says cannot fail to make a lasting impression.

D. APPLETON & CO., NEW YORK.

Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.

The French Revolutionary Epoch: being a History of France from the Beginning of the First French Revolution to the End of the Second Empire. By Henry Van Laun. 2 Vols. pp. 503 and 454. 1879.

Mr. Van Laun is well known as the translator of Taines' "English Literature." The work before us will introduce him to a wider circle of readers. The French Revolutionary epoch presents a period marked by political, religious and social forces and movements, and crowded with events and changes that can never cease to be intensely interesting. The author has based his work mainly on the *Histoire des Francais*, by Lavallée and Lock, and aims to present to the general reader, in a concise form, a history of France from the first Revolution to the end of the Second Empire. In an Introductory chapter he traces the condition of France during several preceding centuries, and brings to view the wretched condition of the people when Louis XVI. ascended the throne. Then in successive books, he gives account of the Gathering of the Storm, The Republic, The Directory, The Consulate, The Empire, The Restoration, The Reign of Louis Phillippe, The Second Empire. The last chapter traces the downward course of imperialism, and the events of the Franco-Prussian war which so recently drew the eyes of the world. He has given a most interesting history of one of the world's most exciting periods.

S. C. GRIGGS & COMPANY, CHICAGO.

Oratory and Orators. By William Mathews, LL. D., author of "Getting on in the World," "The Great Conversers," "Words; Their Use and Abuse," etc., etc. pp. 456. 1879.

Dr. Mathews has acquired a reputation as a book-maker. This last volume—the last so far—will be no less popular than any of its predecessors. The subject is inviting. The treatment of it is in the most popular style, abounding in illustrations and anecdotes concerning a large number of orators, including those of different ages, countries, and callings in life. Some of these authors are handled rather carelessly. Gladstone may be surprised to find himself styled SIR William, and Rev. Phillips Brooks is introduced to the reader both as PHILIP Brooks and as DR. Brooks. We commend the volume to all who desire something attractive and instructive to read on this subject—ORATORY AND ORATORS.

Getting on in the World, or Hints on Success in Life. By the same author. pp. 365. 1879.

This was the first published of Prof. Mathew's works. It at once made him a reputation and guaranteed his literary success. That, without being a novel, it has reached its "Fortieth Thousand" is creditable both to the author who has written the work and to the public that buys it. It is full of earnestness and eloquence, and should be read by all young men.

J. M. STODDARD & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

The Encyclopædia Britannica. A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature. Ninth Edition. (American Reprint.) Vol. VIII. pp. 749. 1878.

This great work goes steadily forward. Vol. VIII. brings us down to the letter F. (Fakir), and embraces a number of lengthy and most valuable articles. It will be enough to mention Electricity, England, English Language and Literature, Europe, Evolution, without any others, to show that the volume must be one of great interest and value. We had marked some points for criticism, especially the article on Evolution, but are hindered from saying more at this time by want of space. We may recur to this volume again. This American Edition deserves a wide circulation.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, for January, has been received. This old and standard Review, after becoming a bi-monthly, has now become a monthly. It will continue to be issued by D. Appleton & Co., at $5 a year, or 50 cents a number.

The Foreign Quarterlies and Blackwood, Harper's Periodicals, and Littell's Living Age, have been regularly received, and continue to furnish the usual and rich variety of reading.

The Almanacs for 1879, by SEVERINGHAUS & CO., Chicago; and LUTHERAN BOOK STORE, 117 N. 6th, St., Phila., have been received, filled with their usual valuable information.

CONTENTS OF NO. I.

Article. Page.

I. Eternal Punishment,..... 1
By Rev. L. G. M. Miller, Salem, Va.

II. The Relations of the Public Schools to the Colleges..... 28
By Rev. Prof. J. R. Dimm, A. M., of Lutherville Female Seminary.

III. Human Conditions of a Good Prayer Meeting..... 47
By L. A. Gotwald, D. D., York, Penn'a.

IV. The Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.... 67
Translated from the German of Rev. Dr. v. Burger of Munich, by Rev. G. F. Behringer, Mendon, Ill.

V. Thought the Great Reality..... 89
By Prof. W. H. Wynn, Ph. D., State Agricultural College, Ames, Ia.

VI. Acting from Principle..... 113
By M. Valentine, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.

VII. The Historical Witness,..... 131
By Rev. Charles S. Albert, A. M., Carlisle, Pa.

VIII. Literary Intelligence,..... 142
American.—Biblical and Theological—Philosophical and Scientific—Historical and Biographical—Poetry—Miscellaneous.
German.—Biblical—Historical—Systematic—Practical.

IX. Notices of New Publications,..... 145
The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version—Lange's Commentary—A Popular Commentary on the New Testament—Discussions in Church Polity—Gates into the Psalm-Country—Epochs of Modern History—The Ceramic Art—Illustrated History of Ancient Literature, Oriental and Classical—English Men of Letters: Samuel Johnson, Edward Gibbon, Sir Walter Scott, Shelly—Shakespeare's Comedy of Much Ado About Nothing—Stories from Virgil—The Story of the Christians and Moors in Spain—The Æneid of Virgil—The Odyssey of Homer—Visions—Boston Monday Lectures—Outlines of Theology—Theological Lectures—History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin—Home Lessons on the Old Paths—Rock of Ages—Wordsworth—The Unity of the New Testament—Pizarro—Select Poems—Mother-Play, and Nursery Songs—Live Boys—Burying the Hatchet—Flaxie Frizzle Stories—The Atonement Viewed as Assumed Divine Responsibility—Recreation Songs—Sermons—Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures—Through Bible Lands—Life and Adventures in Japan—Guiding Lights—Life of John Eadie, D. D., LL. D.—Socialism—The French Revolutionary Epoch—Oratory and Orators—Getting on in the World.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

APRIL, 1879.

ARTICLE I.

ART IN ITS RELATION TO WORSHIP IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

By Rev. W. STROBEL, D. D., Rhinebeck, New York.

In approaching this subject, I find myself surrounded by embarrassment. I find results difficult of attainment and in the end very inconclusive. Ruskin in speaking his mind expresses himself thus forcibly: "My attention has lately been directed to the subject of religious art, and we are now in possession of all kinds of interpretations and classifications of it, and of the leading facts of its history. But the greatest question of all connected with it remains entirely unanswered. What good did it do to real religion? I have not knowledge enough to form even the shadow of an opinion on this point, and I should be most grateful to any one, who would put it in my power to do so." With such an authority before me, I might well hesitate to write a line.

The subject embraces architecture, music, painting, poetry, (we may even add ecclesiastical history,) in their relation to worship. To apply them, it is difficult to decide where to begin. We turn instinctively to the Jewish temple, with its imposing rituals, every part of it symbolical and designed

to give the people, through these, their highest conceptions of the Infinite Jehovah. But as these "were only the shadow of good things to come," we can not very well look to them for unquestioned guidance. If we take the institution of the Lord's Supper as the initiation of Christian worship, we find an utter absence of everything artistic. A simple upper chamber with its table, seats, and conveniences for the Paschal Supper, that was all. And yet there never was so solemn an assembly, a more heartfelt devotion, a livelier faith, than when that hymn was sung, which closed the solemnities of the evening and was the precursor of the greatest solemnities of that dreadful night. Here we might ask, was this intended to be a pattern for the Church in all the coming ages? I trow not.

From that point we have to trace a long history, following the persecuted in their efforts to serve the Master, kneeling in the Catacombs, whilst overhead the heathen temple, in all its gorgeousness, attracted its votaries. By steps, we cannot trace, we reach by and by the period of the Renaissance, when painting, music, architecture had all become the handmaids of the Church, the splendid ritual of the papacy being fully developed, and Leo X., the patron of every art, reigning in more than regal splendor. To-day the educated traveler from every land seeks the Cathedrals of Italy, some to study the beauty of their proportions, others to be entranced by the music, others to study those wonderful delineations of Bible story, wrought out by some of the great masters of painting. Worship, under such circumstances, must act powerfully upon the imagination and cannot fail to awaken the liveliest enthusiasm. A French writer, somewhat skeptical in his religious opinions, thus writes of the impression made upon him by the services of one night in Passion week. After speaking of the dramatic services descriptive of the Saviour's burial, he adds: "Happy are those who have heard the melodies of Leo, Durante, and Pergolese on the old consecrated text. They have entered heaven for a moment, and their souls have been able to ascend thither without distinction of rank, country, even belief, by those invisible and

mysterious steps, composed, thus to speak, of all the simple, natural, universal sentiments, that everywhere on earth draw from the bosom of the human creature a sigh towards another world."*

This is very beautiful, but the question to be solved is, was the moral equal to the æsthetic effect, or was the former paralyzed or overshadowed by the latter, were the masses elevated in character and made purer in their lives, was the worship spiritual or simply dramatic? The forms, the doctrines of the Church were indeed kept before them then as now. Then as now the supernatural in religion had a deeper hold upon them, than upon any other Christians, as we impress lessons upon the minds of children by pictures, so some of those grand master pieces may have told the story of the cross to the ignorant more powerfully than any printed record. This might always prove true were it not for the frailty of humanity, impressions made upon the imagination being but too easily obliterated by contact with the realities of every day life. It is not so easy for the common mind to pass from the seen to the unseen, from the material to the spiritual, and thus the symbol soon supplanted the reality, making devotion nought but a refined, intellectual, image worship, whilst the strains of music floating through the vaulted arches did little more than nourish a highly cultivated æsthetic taste. What is here worthy of notice is the fact, that this Golden Age of Romanism gave birth to the Protestant Reformation, with its efforts to restore a purer Christianity, which would bring men back to holier lives and assist them to worship the Father in spirit and in truth.

In the reaction of the 16th century, there would be, on the part of many, a tendency to radicalism in their efforts to remove from the Church every thing, which seemed to militate against the simplicity of the Gospel. For our present purpose, it will not be necessary to examine Protestant Church life in European countries. We will only notice, by way of contrast, those attempts which have been made, in more

*Cousin's Lecture on the Beautiful. p. 174.

immediate connection with ourselves, to remove everything, that might be termed artistic from public worship in the churches, which have moved on parallel with our own in this land.

The most radical in its position, was the Society of Friends. The most rigid ideas of simplicity, commencing with the apparel of the individual, passing into social living, regulating their Church buildings and their modes of worship, were adopted, running sometimes even into the grotesque. By excluding every external attraction, it was hoped to develop in the highest degree the purely spiritual. The result has been a beautiful humanitarianism, no aggressive power, inability to secure the control of the young—irreconcilable schisms, and tendency to rapid decadence. There was something needed, more than the merely intellectual, to perpetuate and extend it as a power for good. One of its most intelligent preachers has told me, that he felt the need of a stated ministry, bible classes and Sunday Schools with their necessary adjuncts as essential to their future existence, finding it impossible to be maintained, save with a small and peculiar class of minds of great native simplicity and purity, able to reach high conceptions of the spiritual and divine without external aids.

The earlier efforts of the Wesleyans, followed very much in the same channel, in an attempt to go back to the simplicity of the early days of the Gospel. Leaving the Church of England under protest, not as much against its doctrine, as against the formality of worship, inanity of preaching, laxity of morals, and dearth of spirituality, all was ascribed to the ritualism of the day. In the pursuit of a purer Evangelism they were led to discard everything which might be termed artistic. Their church buildings were simple, inornate, inexpensive; the singing plain, exciting, awakening; the preaching hortative, with direct appeals to the personal conscience; all this adapted the early Methodist Church for successful missionary work, *that* too at a juncture when a seeming apathy rested upon the older Churches. The history of its first

century bears ample testimony to the great work which it has done.

But a great change has been passing over it, not perhaps so much over its spirit as over its external aspects. The people have increased rapidly in wealth, culture, and taste. In all the externals of every day life they cannot be distinguished from others. Their colleges, theological schools, highly educated ministry, have been the natural outgrowth of this. It is strange, that with this change of circumstances they should have caught the spirit of David, when he said to the prophet Nathan, "See now, I dwell in an house of Cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth within curtains." Hence the very natural and very rapid progress they have made in church architecture, conveniences, music, nay in everything that might make worship attractive, and conduce to the comfort and edification of the people.

We may well here ask as to results. Has the change been beneficial or otherwise to that large and influential denomination? The preaching has become intellectual, embracing a wider range of scripture topics, more instructive and convincing, though not so spirit-stirring, laying a deeper foundation for consistent scripture character. Worship is more quiet and subdued, but solemn, devout and spiritual. Religious knowledge is more widely diffused, and while professions are not so loud, the Christian life is better regulated. The disposition to labor and give, to make sacrifices of time and money for the Master, in all the respects of character and Christian activity, they may take a place beside any other Church in the land. Has it been at the expense of anything really essential and useful? In many respects the old discipline has lost its adaptation to the new state of things, and there is some laxity in its observance. There has been a loss of that peculiar power, which Methodism held over the unlettered masses, impairing its influence perhaps for aggressive missionary work. But this has been counterbalanced by an increased influence in the great centres of population. The point we wish to show is simply this, that despite of any debentures, the introduction of art in its relations to worship, into the

Methodist Episcopal Church, has not impaired the religious character of the people. Nor has it deteriorated the spirituality of its services, but improved and elevated them, thus qualifying it for a higher sphere of usefulness.

The development of our own Church has been almost contemporaneous with that of the Methodist, barring the disability of language and the difficulty, for many years, of obtaining a suitable German church literature for our people. The first purely English speaking church was erected within the century. The early Lutheran elements belonged mainly to the laboring classes, whose literary and pecuniary advantages were very limited. Many difficulties had to be overcome before they possessed the commonest comforts of every day life. In the midst of all their embarrassments they adhered with tenacity to the faith of their fathers. With but little extraneous help their early church arrangements had to be extremely simple and unattractive. Here and there we may still find one of those ancient monuments of church love, improved and beautified by recent effort; but most of them are amongst the things which were. The first church in which I ministered, was built of logs—floor, seats, pulpit, all of unplained boards. Within, nothing met the eye but the rough timber—without, naught but the gigantic pine forest in which it was located. The words of the hymn were given out line by line—the singing led by the pastor. I tried to preach, and I have no doubt the people tried to pray—to sing—to listen. It was the best they could do. And I trust that even there the great Master of assemblies met with us, and that souls were educated for the upper sanctuary. But devotion was not easy—order and propriety not always attainable. With such surroundings it was difficult to enforce the injunction, "Reverence my sanctuary." That was only fifty years ago. I preach now, nearly a thousand miles from that locality—but amongst a people of precisely the same antecedents. The church is perfect in its proportions—convenient in all its arrangements, with every facility for conducting worship with comfort and decorum. There are no tawdry ornaments, nothing extravagant, all within the means of a

rural population, plain and simply beautiful. The contrast is wonderful, and I refer to it because similar changes have been taking place in every part of the Church. Has the change been a corresponding one in the worship of the people? The question is, in many respects, difficult of solution. The changes which have taken place in the externals of worship may be traced in a great measure to the spirit which animated David, to which I have already referred. As intelligence, refinement and wealth became the portion of the people, they felt that the house of God should be in harmony with their other surroundings. Such a spirit of Church pride is not to be deprecated as would have our places of worship bear some comparison with those of our neighbors, as well as with our own homes. I find it no easy thing to trace the influence of these externals upon the inner life as manifested in our worship. Its natural simplicity is not susceptible of very elaborate artistic adornments, nor would the spirit of our institutions encourage them. But whatever is done, in connection with church services, should be well done, so as to make it the most attractive, and conducive to the solemnity contemplated. Whatever will elevate the thoughts, and draw them away from earth, is desirable. I have no doubt that greater attention will be secured in a well ventilated, warmed and cushioned audience room, than where the reverse is the case; harmonious singing, in which there is nothing grating upon the ear must find its sympathy in every Christian heart. The music of our German forefathers was grandly solemn. Nothing could be more deeply devotional than a multitude of voices following the organ in one of their old German chorals. Simple as are our liturgical forms, there is ample room for the most impressive music in the chanting of the two Glorias and Kyrie. All this adds much to the interest and harmony of worship, and I have no doubt that, now more than ever, it is realized that the sanctuary is God's house and the place where His honor dwelleth. The day ought to come, when Lutherans throughout the land would use but one liturgy, so that whenever we entered a church bearing the name of Lutheran, we would be familiar with all

the services. Some of our people have a distaste for every thing liturgical. They will allow a half-trained choir to sing at its option any chant, however inappropriate, but rebel against such as have been used for the last fifteen centuries. So with the reading of the liturgy, in a great measure owing to the imperfect manner in which it is read. Wherever the pastor catches the spirit of the service, and the words flow from his lips as if they were the fresh effusions of the soul, when the words are familiar also to all joining in the service, the confession of sin must be deeper and more intelligent. Is religious worship a rational thing? Then certainly the more harmonious, the more elevating will be its character and the more benign its effect. Is elocution an art? Must not its application to preaching be calculated to make it more impressive and attractive? This can better be realized by two men preaching the same sermon. By the one, every idea will be brought out distinctly, and every truth enforced with power. Its delivery by another would cause it to appear tame and to fall flat upon listless ears. Our schools of learning have created a very great improvement, still leaving much to be desired. I would premise, then, that we might calculate upon good results from all the improvements which have taken place amongst us, so far as they have harmonized with the spirit of our faith. Good and comfortable churches, fine singing, pure and correct reading, with preaching marked by clearness, simplicity and force, must quicken and elevate the spirit of devotion. There has been a marked progress amongst us, in all these respects. There may be, in many places, great room for further development. But the question of primary importance is, have our people been really made better, have they higher conceptions of the divine life, do they exhibit more of the spirit of the Master? Our religion, I think, has become more intelligent, the truth has become more a matter of thought, and is better comprehended. Convictions are deeper, and principles more firmly rooted. There is less of the emotional in our services, while we both sing and pray more with the spirit and the understanding also. Within my range of observation, there is a more consistent performance

of the duties of every-day life. Revivals, as they have been called, may not be so frequent, but there are fewer lapses in those who are gathered into the fold. There has been enkindled a greater church love, arising from the fact that in all our Christian surroundings there is nothing to be ashamed of. With all this there has been developed a great deal of well directed Christian effort. Large parishes have been divided into smaller, with a more liberal ministerial support, our laity display increased activity in the Sunday School work, our Home and Foreign Missionary efforts have renewed interest, there is less danger of losing our own young people, with the prospect of gathering in material from the outside world.

Many causes have contributed to this. Increased wealth, education, the use of the vernacular, have all elevated the condition of the people. The improvements in churches and their services have kept pace, if they have not often been in advance of these. A people of culture will instinctively follow in these matters their cultivated tastes. We have the happy consciousness of believing, that our people have meanwhile been growing in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; that whilst there has been much greater attention paid to the beautiful, there has been an unflinching regard to the good and true.

In the future it may be well for us to be on our guard. Undue attention to what may be termed the formalities of worship have and may still take the place of that which is due to Him who would have the true worshiper worship Him in spirit and in truth. There is a fashion in religion, as well as in every thing else, and we are sometimes influenced and controlled by the ephemeral success, that has attended the efforts of our neighbors. In some of the churches the music has assumed a style more purely operatic than devotional, and I have known the power of many a soul-awakening sermon destroyed by the ill-timed efforts of a very poor choir. Some of the purely ritualistic churches have been trying to throw a charm around their services by the introduction of

symbols very nearly allied to Romanism and leading directly to it. In the flush times which we have had, when money seemed to be abundant, there were attempts to build churches beyond the taste, the needs, and resources of the people, and many are now paying the penalty in heavy debts, which they are unable to bear. It is not unwise to exercise in ecclesiastical matters a little worldly wisdom—to accomplish what we can to make the external harmonize with the spirit of an earnest, intelligent Christian faith. Whatever will make worship more spiritual, give us a deeper interest in truth, develop more of the life of the Master in our lives, we may well cultivate—whatever may have the contrary effect of satisfying the soul with mere outward form, should be repudiated. The difficult task is to mark the proper limitations, particularly where so much is dependent upon mere taste, which is not always chaste and correct. The able writer, from whom I quoted in the commencement of this paper, in speaking of the abuses which have grown out of the application of art to worship, and the difficulty of eliminating the beneficial from the injurious, adds: "It has never been done yet, and the question remains a subject of vain and endless contention between parties of opposite prejudices and temperaments." With such an authority before me, it would be presumptuous to play the part of the oracle in a matter of so much intricacy and so inconclusive in results.

ARTICLE II.

EVOLUTION—SHALL IT BE ATHEISTIC?

By Rev. W. E. Parson, A. M., lately Professor in the Imperial University, Tokio, Japan.

One of the oldest beliefs in the possession of man, is the belief in the existence of God. One of the newest theories, the theory of theories in this day, is the theory of Development, or Evolution, as it is more commonly termed. And the question of questions for every thinking man, for every student, for every scientific man, for every theologian, becomes—Will the theory of Evolution, if once it reaches the point of moral certainty, (as the Copernican and Newtonian theories have done), overthrow the theistic belief? Are the discoveries of modern science to take from man this old possession—his belief in God? Is Development so all-embracing as to preclude the notion or need of Deity? Is the belief in the existence of God antagonistic to the hypothesis of Evolution? Is it, in the nature of that hypothesis, or in the nature of the theistic argument, impossible for the two to stand together?

These are the questions that are stirring in the minds of many in this day. The question is not whether God is good, as some turn aside to discuss. Optimism and pessimism are both aside from the main issue. The question is not even whether Christianity is the only true religion. It is not whether the great mass of mankind is doomed to eternal loss. It is not whether the soul shall be united again to the body in some life that is to come.

But the real question is—Are there rational grounds for any religion? Shall any man survive the dissolution of his body? Is there a soul? Is there a future for it? Is there a God to whom man is responsible? Is there One by whose Will Evolution is carried on?

Is the one great fact unfolded in Christianity more clearly

than anywhere else—the fact of the existence and superintending power of God—worthy of belief? To leave the answer to any one of these questions in doubt, is to leave men in darkness. To undermine any one of these foundation facts, if they be facts, is to remove the solid rock on which the need of religion rests. To establish this old belief, and to keep fast hold of it in the face of most recent speculations, is to make life a thing of sacredness, of obligation, and of hope.

We shall endeavor, in the present article, to clear away some mistakes, and to present some phases of the question now most seriously discussed by thinking men, whether they be physicists or theologians, placing our feet, if possible, more firmly on the rock, that we slide not away through any of the multitude of sophistries that belong to an atheistic evolution.

The first and most serious trouble that suggests itself is the fact that many assume a hostility. They assume that the theory of developement must be in conflict with theism. They never for a moment are willing to grant that Evolution can be other than atheistic.

One says: "All talk of a Creator, a First Cause, a Personal God, having consciousness and benevolence, is pure speculation. Our scientific method can not touch the matter. No *experimentum crucis* can be applied. We must substitute for God the Zeit-Geist. We shall follow only Law. Science is our religion. We are her priests."

The other says: "Science is a usurper. She is undermining religion. Let us beware of her philosophy, falsely so called."

We refer now to the ultra-radicals, the narrowest minds, on both sides. It is to be regretted that such a spirit should be abroad. So long as such men are our teachers, we can not hope for peace. Every clergyman who sneers at science, and every scientific man who ignores religion, is retarding the progress of truth.

There is a more honorable way, which I can best indicate in the words of one who holds that the Evolution theory is not necessarily atheistic in its tendencies.

"Among the most unquestionable rules of scientific method is that first law that whatever phenomenon is, is. We must ignore no existence whatever; we may variously interpret or explain its meaning and origin, but if a phenomenon does exist it demands some kind of explanation. * * If men do act, feel and live as if they were not merely the brief products of a casual conjunction of atoms, but the instruments of a far-reaching purpose, are we to record all other phenomena and pass over these? We investigate the instincts of the ant and the bee and the beaver, and discover that they are led by an inscrutable agency to work towards a distant purpose. Let us be faithful to our scientific method, and investigate also those instincts of the human mind, by which man is led to work as if the approval of a Higher Being were the aim of life."*

There is no doubt that a large measure of the hostility of Science to Religion is accounted for in the fact that once Religion was uniformly hostile to Science. But that day has gone by. There may be ignorant men who retain some of the old hostility. There may be some forms of the theistic beliefs that array themselves against the theories that are today growing into universal acceptance; but, that Religion, that Theism, that Christianity even, is hostile, or in any measure disposed to shrink from the widest application of any reasonable theory, no man can affirm who knows the disposition of the most advanced thinkers and teachers in Christian Theology.

There is still one more reason for this hostility, which we must notice. It is found in the tendency of scientific research. Dr. Carpenter has stated the case clearly, at the same time entering a strong protest, with emphatic testimony to the fact that the existence of God ought to be the first assumption of every philosopher, and more especially of him whose field of study is in the midst of visible and created things. He says:

"The more constant and invariable the great Agencies of

*Jevon's "Principles of Science," vol. II., pp. 469, 470.

Nature are found to be, and the more what at first seemed exceptional phenomena are brought within the domain of Law, the more, on a superficial view, does it appear as if the Order of Nature were simply mechanical, going on *of itself*, as it has done through all the past, and will continue to do through the future. But a deeper scrutiny has shown us that the man of science can not dispense with the notion of a Power always working throughout the Mechanism of the Universe; and that on scientific grounds alone, this Power may be regarded as the expression of Mind."*

Scientific men are apt to forget that there may be some facts not physical. They do not feel that thought is the great reality, and by the very character of their studies they are often precluded from taking in the whole field. And this it is that presents us with the phenomenon of a mind like that of Laplace, able to give birth to such an astounding theory as the Nebular Hypothesis, able also to gather from every quarter the facts that shall arrange themselves under this Hypothesis by way of confirmation, until we feel that we have attained the strength of a demonstration; a mind familiar with suns, and systems, and nebulæ, rejecting the simpler, older hypothesis of the existence of

"Some Great Maker,
In Goodness and in Power pre-eminent;"

refusing to make the most probable inference, that "Nature is but the name for an effect whose Cause is God."

The proof of the existence of God must rest, in great part, on the very phenomena with which Science is occupying herself. If the universe is a creation, we must certainly be able to discover something of the Power and Character of the Creator, through a diligent study of the phenomena on which His purpose and methods have imprinted themselves. And it is because of all the newer and more startling revelations disclosed by the discoveries of modern science, that the Theist is justified in claiming that the old hypothesis, of the existence of a Great First Cause, has reached the point of

---

* W. B. Carpenter's Mental Physiology, p. 699.

moral certainty. "It is the high prerogative of Science to demonstrate the *unity* of the Power which is operating through the limitless extent and variety of the universe, and to trace its *continuity* through the vast series of ages that have been occupied in its evolution."*

Unless, therefore, scientific men are prepared to be as dogmatic as theologians have been, they must accept some form of Theism, or be silent. Unless they are prepared to assert that when their investigations are made, all is known of Nature that can be known, they cannot affirm that the theistic conception of the universe is a false one.

In endeavoring to clear away some misunderstandings, it will be convenient to notice first a logical difficulty. This logical difficulty meets us in connection with the terms and definitions of Science. So far as mere physical phenomena are concerned, it is sufficient to say that they all range themselves under a few wide generalizations. But there are some phenomena that can scarcely be accounted for by the working of law, apart from the conception of an intelligent Controller of law. These phenomena belong to the mind itself, and the contemplation of them creates the logical difficulty.

With respect to physical phenomena we agree that the end of Scientific investigation is simply stated by Mr. Mill, when he propounds the question:

"What are the fewest assumptions, which being granted, the Order of Nature as it exists would be the result? What are the fewest general propositions, from which all the uniformities existing in Nature could be deduced?"

This question satisfactorily answered for us by scientific men would result in peace to the mind, by showing it that no point in all the universe could be outside the reign of law. We should derive comfort in thinking that even the wastes, the disorders, the seeming chaoses of Nature, were but the result of all-pervading, and all prevailing law.

But with this question as to the visible universe answered, we should, as thinking beings, be impelled to pass on and ask

---

* Dr. Carpenter's Mental Physiology, p. 697.

Whence the universe, with the forces that rule in it? Why do we find law everywhere ruling, with such mathematical precision? If science is correct in saying that every physical process of a thousand ages past existed potentially in some primitive incandescent vapor, we must still insist that this is not a sufficient explanation of the genesis of things. We are bewildered at the thought of the time and the space over which this explanation spreads itself, but taking breath, we ask, Whence this star-dust that has in itself all the possibilities of this present? Science says: Give us vapor and motion, and the existence of all worlds is easy. Reason says: That is only placing the difficulty a few removes further back. Whence this fire-mist and motion? is as difficult of explanation as a finished universe.

Following further this logical difficulty, we are led to ask why it is, if the vegetable and animal kingdoms have attained their present order and perfection through a long continuing process of evolution, that the methods have been so infallible, and the means so exactly fitted for the ends? Why does not a study of Nature lead us to conclude that blind chance has been the supreme idea in our own Solar System? What is this life-stuff that has pervaded all forms of existence? Whence have come these marvels of change, by formation and re-formation through countless orders, under cycles of changing condition, resulting in a being who, though he may classify himself with the animal, feels in sane moments an immeasurable gulf between himself and the highest form of the animal creation?

Science may raise such ghosts, but she can not lay them; and scientific men of all schools, with bowed head and reverent tone, are beginning to answer—Some One not ourselves, with wisdom beyond what we can know, with power beyond what we can do, must be carrying on this creative work, evolving in marvelous fashion this orderly universe.

Looking in the same spirit at the great scientific hypothesis which is occupying thinking men of our day, the Development Hypothesis, and assuming for a moment that it is true, then the real question begins. What is this process we designate as

Evolution, or Development? Is it a blind process of unintelligible, unconscious force, which knows no end, adopts no means, has no design? Is it an intelligent process directed by intelligence? Is there a Creator who is guiding creation by evolution into ways that suit His will, with gravity, electricity, all forces and all laws as His agents? The affirmative answer to these questions would give us a scheme of theistic Evolution. The negative answer would give us atheistic Evolution. One of these two, in the present state of the question, we shall be compelled to choose. Those who make the negative reply, choosing Atheistic Evolution, continually assure us that when we have catalogued the forces at work in Nature, and designated the method of Development, covering our ignorance by wise words, we have reached the sum of our possible, positive knowledge concerning the origin and destiny of the universe. To this we have to bring up our logical difficulty. Its essence lies in this, that when an explanation of phenomena is reached, we demand an explanation of the explanation. We ask if there is not a greater Law ruling among the laws of the universe.

It is quite possible to believe that the men who are now working upon the Evolution Hypothesis are doing so honestly, searching with right intent what, or what manner of time all these varied phenomena do signify; and it is further quite possible for us to think that this Hypothesis, as modified by subsequent discovery, will be universally accepted, being found to be no more in conflict with Revelation and Redemption than the less recent astronomical and geological discoveries. But we are at liberty, in the meantime, to enter our conviction that Evolution, apart from the presence and control of a Higher Power, must always remain not only an impossible thing, but an absurdity, in order to reject which we need but consult our own reason.

For, to think that all the machinery of this wide universe of which we form a part has evolved itself from some former condition, that might be described as a mighty maze, and all without a plan, or Planner; to think that matter, instead

of being but passive under plastic guidance, is guiding itself, is organizing itself, and evolving itself, from lower forms to higher, through all the ramifications of genera, species and variety, with a blind unconsciousness against which we who are conscious can raise no hand to hinder, is to think the unthinkable. Theology has no assumption so absurd and illogical as that would be. We could as well think that a ship, furnished with every nicest contrivance and most delicate machinery, if set adrift upon some shore, with no living soul on board, no intelligent will to control, direct and use what had been provided, would find its way duly and safely into a distant haven. Nay! fully to represent the absurdity of such a thought, we should need to picture the finished ship as having slowly grown up out of the waste of waters, with no visible cause; as furnishing itself according to some law that went blindly groping after it knew not what; as sailing away of its motion to some definite but unknown port, and as gaining it.

This illustrates for us the logical difficulty, and compels us to say that if our race is slowly working its way toward some destined goal, it must be for the reason that some Power not ourselves is bringing us into the haven where we would be.

As to the Darwinian Hypothesis, as one phase of present Evolution theories, we are brought to face this question: If the hypothesis that species have come into existence through natural selection, resulting from the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest in that struggle, should be verified, still is not the thought of God just as necessary to help us to any conception of the origin of the universe and the method of this development as it was before the annunciation of this hypothesis?

Can the proof of the existence of God be in any wise affected by theories as to the mode, relative rapidity, or nature of the forces, of the creative process?

And here we meet with a point to be constantly kept in mind in all our study of this question as to whether Evolution is to be theistic or atheistic. It is the fact that Evolution can

not claim to be a theory as to the origin of the universe. It is not the cause whose effect is the universe. At the most it is only a method, a process; a something which must itself have a cause; a something which, in the very nature of it, demands both power and intelligence; a something which may help us to understand why there should be variety in life, but helping us not one iota in understanding why life should be.

When Mr. Tyndall tells us in one of his recent addresses that he holds that "the order and energy of the universe are inherent and not imposed," what does he tell us? Simply this—that, since Evolution must assume either the creation or the self-existence of matter, as it is in matter that order and energy manifest themselves, if these are inherent they must be either eternally inherent or derivedly inherent. If they are eternally inherent they may be but modes of theEternal God, as Spencer calls force—"a mode of the Unknowable." If, on the other hand, order and energy are derived and inherent, they must be derived from some source that is underived, which may be God.

In either case, we come back to this conclusion, that science must always reach a point where her method will not apply. The difficulties will not vanish until we reach and rest on that oldest of all the theories, the hypothesis that God is, and by Him do all things consist.

Coming back again to the Evolution hypothesis, we lay it under the same logical difficulty, so that it becomes the miracle of miracles, if we remove the idea of God. Only two possibilities remain to us; either matter is eternal, or it is not. If it is not eternal, how it should begin to be lays before our minds the same perplexity that is presented in the Theistic and Biblical doctrine of creation. There must be some original elements on which Evolution works, some matter to be developed.

If we take the other horn of the dilemma and declare that, for all we know, matter is eternal, we do not lessen, much less remove the difficulty. For if matter is eternal, Evolu-

tion ought also to be eternal, unless we can show cause why it should begin. But the present condition of the universe leads to no such conclusion as that Evolution has been going on forever. Indeed, all the results of scientific discovery point in an opposite direction. The universe can not therefore be admitted to be self-existent and eternal, unless we contradict the testimony we are able to gather, confirmed by every hypothesis and by every known fact of Science, that this process we designate as Evolution, now going on under our eyes, began within some finite period; and further, that it will terminate, at least so far as our own particular system is concerned, within some definite period of time that might be, that has been, approximately estimated. To say therefore, in the light of the fact that no theory yet proposed by science leads us up to the conception of the eternity of matter, that creation is unthinkable, as some scientific men assert, is to say no more than we must say of Evolution. The atheistic Evolutionist who thinks he has made out a case that is free from the difficulties of creation, is certainly mistaken. There is not one phase of the most recent speculations concerning the physical universe that does not postulate the existence of Matter and Force. But is it possible to think of Matter without an origin, or of Force without a Will or Source?

Even Comte, whose system of Positive Polity is simply a religion without a God, tenders such testimony as the following: "The Order of Nature is doubtless very imperfect in every respect; but its production would be far more compatible with the hypothesis of an intelligent Will than with that of a blind mechanism."*

The hypothesis of Evolution is unthinkable until Matter and Force are granted, and these are more than modes of the Unknowable, unless we are prepared to assert that ages of study devoted by countless minds to an effect gives no information whatever respecting its cause.

The reader will note that we are not deriding the Evolu-

*Positive Polity, vol. I., p. 37.

tion hypothesis. As a theory of the method of creation it may yet be found to be true. Many Christian teachers already accept it as such. We ought all, as intelligent men, and especially as Christian ministers, hold ourselves in that frame of mind that shall be receptive and not hostile, lest haply we be found even to fight against God.

But this may we prejudge without prejudice, that as a theory of the origin of the universe Evolution is involved in scientific and metaphysical difficulties such as can not be got rid of by a juggling with words.

Let us attend carefully to a definition, and we shall perhaps be helped out of this logical difficulty.* If Evolution is a term to be constantly applied to the universe in such connection as to suggest the idea that Nature is determining in itself its own methods, and in and of itself working out the order, beauty and adaptation of the entire Kosmos; if it is proposed by the theory of Evolution to account for the Universe, with its manifold and wonderfully complicated plan, then have we set before us an idea that is simply unintelligible. Let the word Evolution be replaced by some other word, such as "growth," and "we find ourselves accounting for the Universe and its manifold forms by the childish mode of saying that they exist because they grew." It is not caricature to say that this is the simplicity of "Topsy" over again. The same idea, invested with the sober terms of Philosophy and Science, is put forth as a sufficient explanation of the origin and development of all the physical universes. They were not made by God. They grew; they were evolved.

The same ambiguity belongs to the words "Development," "Natural Selection," "Survival of the Fittest." Selection involves intelligence somewhere. That it is natural and orderly does not make against the presence of intelligence, rather it favors the thought. In the degree that the selection is natural, and accords with some uniform-

---

* For the phraseology of the next few sentences, I am indebted in part to President Anderson, of Rochester University, whose clear statement may be found in the *Proceedings of the New York Evangelical Alliance, p. 321.*

ly recurring law, or plan, or system, in that degree is intelligence more clearly shown.

Development is literally an unrolling; and to think of the universe as being thus and not otherwise for no other reason than that it has so unrolled itself, is neither science nor sense. Development is unintelligible without the implied conception of something of a plan, or thought, or type-concept, previously enveloped in the orderly acting force which produces the result. The law of the survival of the fittest can not go into operation until there is something on which the law can operate. To speak of the law as a law is assuming that it has a domain in which it may rule. It involves the fact that there are present in the universe types and forms of life able to survive in the struggle for existence, because of the perfection of their form, the delicacy and completeness of their adjustment to the external conditions in which they are placed. The very presence of these conditions of life, and the adjustment between them and the types of organized life, involve foresight, choice, method, and intelligence.

The sooner we understand that Evolution is not, and, in the nature of things can not be, a theory as to the origin of the universe, the sooner we shall cease vain discussion.

The tendency, among the leaders in Science, is to confine the question within the limits here indicated. It is recognized that, while Evolution, as a theory to account for the method, or the process, or the order, (as we may choose to term it), by which the energy of the universe has manifested itself, is most plausible, it does not throw one ray of light upon the question as to the real origin or genesis of the universe. It gives us no hint as to why the order and energy inhering in the universe should manifest themselves thus and not otherwise. Our ancient book of Genesis is still the only document that pretends to enter into the origin of things.

With such definitions, and under such limitations as are here indicated, we may understand how one might declare it as his conviction that the theory of Evolution is not an antitheistic, much less an atheistic, hypothesis. We may go

further, and declare that it need be neither anti-Christian, nor anti-Biblical.

The Evolution Hypothesis logically demands theism, and the mystery is that any man holding the theory should insist on making it atheistic. Indeed, we shall find that it is only the second-rate men in Science who think Evolution a universal solvent; who act and think as though there could be no Creator, because, forsooth, they have discovered one of the secrets of creation. It would be difficult to point out any single case, among those who hold what might be termed extreme views upon the theory of Evolution, where the possibility of a Personal Creator is not admitted. Nor shall we find a case where the probability of some revelation other than is contained in the works of creation is not admitted, or at least not denied. The question of a First Cause may be ignored, but commonly scientific men have not shown themselves so unscientific as to deny the existence of such a First Cause. The great minds who have thought out this hypothesis, and gathered the facts to substantiate it, have not been led by their theories into an avowal of atheism. Their over-wise followers, and their unwise opponents, have been guilty of the mistaken conclusion that if Evolution stands Theism falls. Mr. Lecky has given us the state of the case exactly, when he says: "Nearly every science when it has first arisen, has had to contend with two great obstacles—with the unreasoning incredulity of those who regard novelty as necessarily a synonym for falsehood, and with the unrestrained enthusiasm of those who, perceiving vaguely and dimly a new series of yet undefined discoveries opening upon mankind, imagine that they will prove a universal solvent."*

Suppose, without proposing to discuss the particular work that Mr. Darwin, or Mr. Huxley, or Mr. Herbert Spencer has contributed toward the establishing of the Evolution hypothesis, we turn aside to ascertain whether, by their own admissions, their conclusions have led them into atheism. If we could find that these men, the confessed leaders in investiga-

*History of Rationalism, vol. I., p. 293.

tion, had not been compelled to yield the theistic idea, but on the contrary have taken their positions, though to us seeming anti-Christian, and at the same time have held fast in some definite or vague way to the conception of One Superintending Power, we should be compelled in fairness to grant the possibility of a reconciliation between the Evolution hypothesis and Theism. We might be helped to the conclusion that Evolution is not necessarily atheistic.

An examination of the works of Mr. Darwin will reveal to us that it is not part of his purpose to account for the origin of life. He assumes life as already existing, and his speculations and investigations have dealt only with the forms of organic life. In speaking of the question as to the existence of a Creator, he says that this question "has been answered in the affirmative by the highest intellects that have ever lived."*

Again, in closing the second edition of his work on the "Origin of Species," he defends himself against the misrepresentations he had been subjected to, thus: "I see no good reason why the views given in this volume should shock the religious feeling of any one. It is satisfactory, as showing how transient such impressions are, to remember that the greatest discovery ever made by man, namely, the law of the attraction of gravity, was also attacked by Leibnitz 'as subversive of natural, and inferentially of revealed, religion."† His closing sentence is: "There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms, or into one; and that, whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being evolved."‡

That Mr. Darwin had no intention of undermining religion in his work, is plain from the concluding remarks in his "Descent of Man," where he declares:

"I am aware that the conclusion arrived at in this work will

---

*Descent of Man, vol. I., p. 63.

†Origin of Species, Am. Ed., p. 421. ‡Origin of Species, p. 429.

be denounced by some as highly irreligious; but he who thus denounces them, is bound to show why it is more irreligious to explain the origin of man as a distinct species by descent from some lower form, through the laws of variation and natural selection, than to explain the birth of the individual through the laws of ordinary reproduction. The birth both of the species and of the individual are equally parts of that grand sequence of events, which our minds refuse to accept as the result of blind chance. The understanding revolts at such a conclusion, whether or not we are able to believe that every slight variation of structure, the union of each pair in marriage, the dissemination of each seed, and other such events, have all been ordained for some special purpose."*

And further, in coming to some conclusion as to Mr. Darwin's place with respect to a belief in God, we ought to give him the benefit of the three mottoes, inserted by him in every edition of the "Origin of Species." These extracts are read with interest, in the light of the fact that the author has made them his own in this very emphatic way. The first is an extract from Whewell's Bridgewater Treatise; the second is from Butler's Analogy; the third is from Bacon's Advancement of Learning, as follows:

"To conclude, therefore, let no man out of a weak conceit of sobriety, or an ill-applied moderation, think or maintain, that a man can search too far or be too well studied in the book of God's word, or in the book of God's works; divinity or philosophy; but rather let men endeavor an endless progress or proficience in both."

In the light of which we ought to accord to Mr. Darwin an honest motive, not attributing an atheistic intent so long as he avows the contrary; and especially ought we be ready to agree that more than any one of his day has he helped on the endeavor of men after a "progress or proficience" in the study of the book of God's works.

Mr. Wallace, in his address as President of the Biological

*Descent of Man, vol. II., p. 378.

section of the British Association, at Glasgow in 1876, said: "For theology the question between Evolution and Anti-Evolution, is simply a question between mediate and immediate creation; and even this, in view of the immanence of the Creator, becomes little more than a question of the human mode of conception of his work. * * The doctrine of Evolution as proceeding from and guided by a Power above Nature has nothing in it in anywise inimical to theology. On the contrary, nothing can bring us nearer to the old view of the Hebrew seers, that God is everywhere, and that all that is done on earth, or in heaven, or under the earth, is done by him, than this latest stretch of scientific thought, that all is the effect of Evolution, but that this Evolution must take place under a Power 'inscrutable to the intellect of man.'"

Dr. Carpenter's testimony is equally forcible:

"That any antagonism should be supposed to exist between those 'Laws' which express the Uniformities of Nature discovered by Science, and the Will of the Author of Nature as manifested in those uniformities,—so as for the acceptance of the former to exclude the notion of the latter,—can only arise either from an unworthy conception of the Deity as an arbitrary and capricious ruler, or from an unphilosophical conception of the real meaning of Science as the intellectual interpretation of Nature."

Even more helpful in answering our question—*Is Evolution Atheistic?*—is the following from Jevons' Principles of Science:

"The theories of Darwin and Spencer are doubtless not demonstrated; they are to some extent hypothetical, just as all the theories of physical science are to some extent hypothetical, and open to doubt. But I venture to look upon the theories of Evolution and Natural Selection in their main features, as two of the most probable hypotheses ever proposed, harmonizing and explaining as they do immense numbers of diverse facts. * * Granting all this, I can not for a moment admit that the theory of Evolution will alter our theo-

logical views. That theory embraces several laws or uniformities which are observed to be true in the production of living forms; but these laws do not determine the size and figure of living creatures, any more than the law of gravitation determines the magnitudes and distances of the planets."*

And again,—"Theologians have dreaded the establishment of the theories of Darwin and Spencer, as if they thought that those theories could explain everything upon the purest mechanical and material principles, and exclude all notions of design. They do not see that those theories have opened up more questions than they have closed. The doctrine of Evolution gives a complete explanation of no single living form. * * The origin of everything that exists is wrapped up in the past history of the universe. At some one or more points in past time there must have been arbitrary determinations which led to the production of things as they are."†

Dr. Draper, in considering recently the consequences of the acceptance of the Evolution hypothesis, maintained that we should gain "nobler views of this great universe of which we form a part; nobler views of the manner in which it has been developed in past ages to its present state; nobler views of the laws by which it is now maintained; nobler expectations as to its future. * * Above all, our conceptions of the unchangeable purpose, of the awful majesty of the Supreme Being, become more vivid. We realize what is meant when it is said, 'With whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.'"

Dr. Winchell's testimony is: "Should these doctrines [of Evolution] become proven, even in their extreme phases, there will be no proof of the absence of immediate divine agency from any of the operations of life; and, having seen organization emerge from inert matter, we can believe more easily than before that God made man of the dust of the earth. In any issue of scientific investigation in a new development of

---

*Jevons' "Principles of Science," vol. II., p. 461.

†Principles of Science, vol. II., pp. 463–4.

truth, Christian Theism has nothing to fear, but only new truth to gain."*

The last whom we shall quote, on the scientific side, will be Mr. Herbert Spencer. Speaking of the evolution of life, he says: "Either the multitudinous kinds of organisms that now exist, and the still more multitudinous kinds that have existed during past geological eras, have been from time to time separately made; or they have arisen by insensible steps, through actions such as we see habitually going on. Both hypotheses imply a Cause. The last, certainly as much as the first, recognizes this Cause as inscrutable. The point at issue is, how this inscrutable Cause has worked in the production of living forms."

This certainly contains all that Theism could ask any scientific man to concede. And so long as Mr. Spencer confines himself to the point at issue, which is not,—Is there an Inscrutable Cause? nor,—What is the nature of this Cause? but,—How has this Inscrutable Cause worked in the production of living forms? no one will join issue with him for calling this Cause inscrutable. Indeed, the only conclusion that science can reach concerning the Cause of all things is that it is inscrutable. But this makes neither against Theism nor Christianity, but rather coincides with the conclusions of both. We recall a question asked by an ancient theist—"Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? * * The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea."†

Beside these opinions of scientific men, we shall place two or three extracts as indicative of the position theology may take on this question.

Professor Flint, of the University of Edinburgh, closed a recent course of lectures on Theism thus:

"I have challenged the theology of Mr. Darwin, and those who follow his guidance in theology. I have no wish to dispute his science. I pass no judgment on his theories so far as they are scientific theories. It may be safely left to the

*Winchell's "Evolution," p. 123. †Job 11 : 7—9.

progress of scientific research to determine how far they are true and how far erroneous. We ought not to assail them needlessly, or to reject the truth which is in them, under the influence of a senseless dread that they can hurt religion. In so far as they are true, they must be merely expressions of the way in which Divine intelligence has operated in the universe. Instead of excluding, they must imply belief in an all-originating, all-foreseeing, all-fore-ordaining, all-regulative intelligence, to determine the rise, and the course, and the goal of life, as of all finite things. That intelligence far transcends the comprehension of our finite minds, yet we apprehend it as true intelligence. It is no blind force, but a Reason which knows itself, and knows us, and knows all things, and in the wisdom of which we may fully confide, even when clouds and darkness hide from us the definite reasons of its operations. We can see and know enough of its wisdom to justify faith where sight and knowledge are denied to us. Let us trust and follow it, and without doubt, it will lead us by a path which we knew not, and make darkness light before us, and crooked things straight."*

The Rev. Canon Curteis in the January *Contemporary*, representing many in the Church of England, from which organization Mr. Darwin has never separated himself, writes: "To a large and increasing number of Churchmen the Evolution hypothesis appears, not only profoundly interesting, but probably true. They find there nothing to shake their faith, and a good deal to confirm it. Man is what he is, in whatever way he may have become so. And how Atheists can persuade themselves that this beautiful theory of the Divine method helps their denial of a deity, the modern school of theologians is at a loss to understand. For the cosmic force whom Christians worship has, from the very beginning, been represented to them, not as a fickle, but as a continuous and a law-abiding energy. "My Father worketh hitherto," said Christ. "Not a sparrow falleth to the ground" without His cognizance. "The very hairs of your head are all number-

*Flint's "Theism," pp. 208–9.

ed." "In Him we live and move and have our being." Pictorial expressions, no doubt. But what words more clearly indicate the unbroken continuity of causation in nature than these texts from the Christian Scriptures."

The third and only other citation we shall make in this connection is from Prof. Tayler Lewis.

"Many in the Church are shivering with alarm at the theories, which are constantly coming from the scientific world, about the origin of species, and the production of man, or rather the physical that may have become man, through the lower types. * * * The reasons are strong for interpreting "man from the earth," as we interpret, the fish and the reptile from the waters. If the formative word יְצַר is used in the one case, so is בָּרָא, which some regard as the more directly creative, employed in the other: "And God created the great whales, and the moving thing which the waters swarmed," that is, all the marine animals from the greatest to the least. The one language is no more inconsistent with the idea of a *process* than the other. There is nothing then to shock us as anti-scriptural in the thought that man, too, as to his physical and material, is a product of nature."*

And again, "No one supposes that the making of the human body was an immediate making *de nihilo*. It was made from earth, and this earth already had its nature according to its varieties of carbon, nitrogen, etc., and these, as natures, connected with the other natures, entered into the human body. If it is not a creation *de nihilo*, which is expressly contrary to the language of the account, we must suppose a connection with nature to a certain extent. What difficulty or danger, then, in giving to the phrase "from the earth," the widest sense consistent with the idea of man's having an earthly as well as a heavenly origin? It is this latter idea, and the higher psychology connected with it, that furnishes to the faith its shield against all mere theories of development that may pro-

* "T. L." in a Foot-note in Lange on Genesis, p. 174.

ceed, with weaker or stronger evidence, from a naturalizing science."*

After these many and lengthy quotations may we not make our interrogation with which we set out an affirmation, declaring that Evolution need not be atheistic? We have seen that on the side of science many holding to the Evolution hypothesis do also hold to a theistic conception of the universe. We have further seen how many on the side of a Christian Theism stand ready to accept the most extreme Evolution theories as not necessarily in conflict with a Biblical theology. How they make the reconciliation is not the thing we are searching after in this article. The fact is all we care now to know.

We have endeavored, though in an unsatisfactory way, to show that there are weighty reasons for believing, not only that God is, but that no theory of science can affect this belief. Putting it on the lowest ground, Theism, as a mere theory, is sublimer, more hopeful, fuller of dignity than any theory science boasts. For Evolution is but a theory as to our origin; and granting it true, it can only tell us whence we came; while Theism has in it a theory as to our destiny, telling us of the future into which we pass when we go hence. Many of the leaders in scientific investigation do now accept Theism as a working hypothesis, and in company with theologians are finding in their most advanced discoveries new reasons for believing that this whole universe of ours, evolving through countless ages, is intelligible only on the supposition that a God of Power, Wisdom, and Benevolence is guiding all forces to ends that are best.

---

* "T. L." in Foot-note on Genesis, p. 211.

ARTICLE III.

PREACHERS' SONS.

By Rev. Prof. J. B. Focht, Selinsgrove, Pa.

False statements are never more dangerous than when they have been crystallized into the form of a proverb or common saying. They then seem to assume an unquestioned authority, and such authority is ever asserted against the honest inquirer for truth. Only those who are given to careful investigation, know how much of what the world believes rests on mere assertion. Baseless assumptions, baseless, because they rest on some such familiar saying false as to fact, often lead to very wrong conclusions. There are perhaps no more unworthy sentiments, more dangerous heresies, or more mischievous lies than those asserted in this common form. It is well enough to reverence authority, and accept the results of past experience, but it is servile to give even a quiet acquiescence to such misstatements as have scarcely an appearance of plausibility. So it happens that such sayings have been disparagingly fastened on all classes of men and motives and actions. Accepting some such statement as true much real harm is done, and much discussion often wasted in the effort to determine the cause or philosophy of what never has been true and is not now true.

Of late much has been said, and said with good effect, concerning the pulpit, its requirements, its amenities, its great part in the work of purifying the world from evil, and much of what was shown to be merely conventional rubbish has been cleared away. We find that gradually there is granted to the preacher greater social liberty and influence, that with clearer knowledge of the facts in the case, many misapprehensions have been removed, and that much which was supposed to be inseparably connected with this holy office, rests for its authority on nothing better than mere arbi-

trary opinion. A little agitation serves to exhibit the true character and relations of the preacher, and we think some what the same result will be effected by an inquiry concerning the question of the alleged worthlessness of preachers' sons. Here as in much else that concerns the preacher, when once it is made a question of fact rather than of tradition, an error will be corrected, and an unjust assertion will be seen to rest on a very unsatisfactory basis. The question then to be asked is not, "Why are preachers' sons so worthless?" but what must precede such an interrogatory, "Are they worthless?" It is better to determine the fact before theorizing as to the philosophy of the matter in hand. That such a statement concerning this asserted worthlessness of preachers' sons, should be so long continued, so widely spread and apparently so firmly believed, is certainly not without some reason.

The questions which will naturally come up, when considering this matter, are such as these, "Is there anything peculiar in the training of preachers' sons, in the relation of the preacher to his family, in the relation of his sons to society?" "Is there anything to lead them to peculiar views on religious subjects?" A full discussion of these and kindred subjects would prove interesting and profitable, but the great question, which must be answered before a clear conclusion is reached, is, "What are the facts?"

In the New Testament we have, again and again, brought out clearly and fully the duty of parents to their children, and upon none are these duties pressed more authoritatively than upon ministers. Among those qualities which in the Epistle to Titus are regarded as necessary in the minister, is this care for the family. The home government is to be such that the minister may be known as one "having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly." He is to have a direct and hearty care for his people, to have very much to do with them in their family relations, and to be their adviser in many cases where great wisdom and the whole weight of his influence are needed to secure a satisfactory settlement of

family troubles. In such cases his influence can not but be affected by the manner in which his own family affairs are known to be conducted. Example is what is needed to give true power to precept. Here might come up the question as to the limit of the pastor's obligations in caring for his people; this we do not intend to discuss; it is enough to say that it may not be at the expense of his own family, lest he be classed among those who in not caring for their own house, have denied the faith and are worse than infidels. In the unreasonable demands which some are disposed to make, the people are often, in a great degree, responsible for the preacher's neglect of his family. When, to maintain social relations with his people, the preacher is compelled to absent himself very much from home, to lose the quiet influence he should have in the family circle, and to resign the care of the children to domestics, whilst he and his wife are attending sociable parties—when this is the case, there is evidently something wrong somewhere. Whether the people may rightly make such demands upon the minister and his wife, is, we think, a question admitting but one answer. We say "preacher and his wife," for some act as if not only the minister but his wife and even his children were included in the call, and were under some sort of obligation to work for the congregation in some public capacity. It is not enough that the minister preach several times on Sunday, lecturing during the week, catechising the young, burying the dead, and counseling the living, but his wife must be called upon personally to supervise the sewing socities, lead the female prayer meeting, and to be in general a leading spirit in such work. Of course such demands cannot be acceded to, without producing an evil result in the neglect of home duties. It is true that such unreasonable demands are not general, but they are too frequently made.

However much the wishes of the people may affect the preacher in his relation to his family, and thus in his influence over his sons, the great fault is not so much with the people as with the preacher himself. The fact that he has important public work to perform does not release him from the duty to

personally affect and mould the character of his sons. There can be no doubt that one of the preacher's greatest helps in his work, is a well regulated family, and it must become quite the reverse of a help when no care is bestowed on it. His success, his continued success, depends very largely upon this very matter. How many become veritable peripatetics because they fail to exert proper control in the affairs of the house.

We may we think assert, that in the faithful minister's family there is nothing, that, in the nature of the case, from the position held by the head of the family, would lead to any such worthlessness as is often alleged concerning preachers' sons.

There is something peculiar in the relation of the preachers' sons to society. Many kinds of amusements, harmless in themselves and in their results, are usually denied preachers' sons, denied them by popular opinion, or if engaged in it must be in the face of such opinion. Much that is considered perfectly proper in others, becomes an almost unpardonable offence in them. Of course in this, as in the matter of the clergyman's dress or the style of his beard, of late years public opinion is granting more latitude, but it is yet true that the preacher's son must consider himself under restraint never imposed on the son of the doctor, or the lawyer, or the merchant. A little harmless pleasantry, that would usually be unnoticed or at most provoke only a smile, has a different effect when indulged in by one of this peculiarly observed class, and causes Mrs. Grundy to lift her spectacles with one hand, while mournfully waving her handkerchief with the other, she exclaims in stereotyped phrase, "What can make preachers' sons so worthless?" There are few preachers' sons who have not felt themselves hemmed in by some such conventional lines. The very fact of such restraint is in itself enough to stir up whatever is combative in an energetic character. It is true that neither the preacher nor his principles are responsible for this, but the fact yet remains that his sons are shackled by unjust restraint. The staid old deacon and his gossiping wife forget that John, the son of the preacher, may be a lad of as energetic disposition, as much

alive to enjoyment, and may feel the young blood coursing as rapidly and as hotly as does John the son of the lawyer.

We believe that in this unjust restraint and invidious distinction, is to be found a reason for much of the unfavorable opinion held with reference to preachers' sons.

Another question of interest is, "What is the influence of the preacher's religious principles upon his family?" None can probably answer this more certainly than ministers' children, none know better than they the continual self sacrifice such a position demands, and the harassing cares and great weariness caused by many and peculiar labors. The people who know their preacher only through the Sunday sermon, have little means of informing themselves of his true character, of the patience, gentle kindness, and the more subdued and kindly virtues, which private life alone reveals. It does seem, however, as if sometimes in the very solicitude manifested for their sons, that they may be examples for the imitation of others, the matter is overdone; and that as soon as, for any reason, restraint is removed, there is reaction. Yet we know that this early training, this care in attending to the religious instruction of the children, is not fruitless. There may be long years of wandering in sin and feeding on husks, but there is ever present the reminder of the father's house.

It often happens that that religion which is so persuasively presented to the public, and so perfectly and beautifully illustrated in the example of the Master, is not so well exemplified in private life. This is true of men in every walk in life, but such inconsistencies are exaggerated when seen in one who is to be a teacher and example in living, and upon none do they exert a worse influence than upon his own children. Now, it is not meant that ministers are cruel, improvident, or absolutely careless of the welfare of their families, but very often their sons fail to see in religion much of anything but a sort of cold, puritanical morality. Christianity in its true character is genial and warming, making happier every relation in life. It restrains, but is a kind and gentle restraint. The recollections of the boyhood of ministers' sons are very often full of little save tasks at the Catechism, or

the Hymn-book. All this is very good, very edifying, but alone is not likely to put religious matters in a true and happy light. But the true and earnest preacher may be sure that his prayers and labors for his own family are not in vain. It would indeed be strange if he should have so much to do in teaching and in guiding in the path of rectitude the sons of others, and yet see his own sons fail to improve by his efforts. Until it is proved, we do not believe that this class of persons is hypocritical, and that they are in general faithless in their home training.

From the influences brought to bear on preachers' sons, there is every reason to expect, not that they would be worthless, but useful members of society. A few facts will also substantiate this.

Whilst the majority of men of note in our national annals have been the sons of farmers, mechanics, and tradesmen, there is a worthy list of eminent Americans whose fathers belonged to the clerical profession. The sons of clergymen and the pupils of parish ministers, those who have been as much as is possible under the influence of the preacher, have occupied, and now occupy, positions of great prominence in American history. As some of those who are worthy of note, we may mention John Hancock, Cotton Mather, Henry Clay, John Trumbull, John Witherspoon, Alexander H. Everett. Samuel Adams, the father of the Revolution, studied with the ministry in view, was always intimate with the clergy, and married a clergyman's daughter, thus showing his confidence in the training of a minister's family. John Adams married a clergyman's daughter, so that John Q. Adams was the grandson of a clergyman. The famous Livingstone family descended from a Scotch clergyman.

Whilst many of the sons of preachers have followed in the profession of their fathers, others of them have risen to eminence in other fields of activity. Among those eminent in their profession may be mentioned, Jonathan Edwards, Dr. Chauncey, Bishop Wainwright, Dr. Ezra Styles, John Eliot, Prof. Levi Frisbie, Hosea Ballou, Sylvester Judd, Stephen H. Tyng, Fisher Ames, and Lieut. Maury. They have distin-

guished themselves as public men, as poets, authors, &c. Prominent in letters and science are the names of Edward Everett, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Prof. S. B. Morse, George Bancroft, S. G. Goodrich, O. W. Holmes, Jas. R. Lowell, Richard Hildreth, Donald G. Mitchell, all preachers' sons. Of the Supreme Court, Judges Field and Strong are the sons of Congregational ministers.

A long list might be furnished of preachers' sons, who became distinguished as clergymen. It has been found on examination, that from a hundred ministers' families, one hundred and ten sons became preachers. Prof. De Candolle, of Geneva, in his book on Science and Scientists, points out the remarkable number of eminent scientific men who were the sons of ministers. As examples are named, Linnæus, Euler, Hartsoker, Jenner, Wollaston, Olbers, Blumenbach, Robert Brown, Berzelius, Encke, Mitscherlich, and many more, among whom is Agassiz. The father of Prof. Agassiz was pastor at Mottier, in the Swiss Canton Freiburg.

It may be said that these men are exceptions, and so they are, rarities in the whole human family, but further examination of the truth will show that ministers' sons are not worthless, a sort of plague on society, that the example of holy living as set forth by their fathers is not without its true influence for good, and that they have been and are now most worthy members of society. It is not, as some seem to think, a disgrace, to be classed among preachers' sons—it is an honor to be in such noble company. There have been those who disgraced their fathers, these will be found all along from the sons of Eli down to the recent infidel son of a devout father, but the very prominence given them is perhaps an evidence of their real rarity, and of the fact that they do not represent the class.

The blessing of God does rest on the families of His servants.

ARTICLE IV.

ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF PREMILLENARIANISM.

By C. A. Briggs, D. D., Professor in Union Theological Sem., N. Y.

Premillenarianism has recently been obtruded upon the Christian people of our land by the "Prophetic Conference" held in the city of New York, on Oct. 30 and 31st, and Nov. 1st, 1878. Ministers and laymen, of various denominations of Christians, signed the call, from which we quote the first section:

"Dear Brethren in Christ: When from any cause some vital doctrine of God's Word has fallen into neglect or suffered contradiction and reproach, it becomes the serious duty of those who hold it, not only strongly and constantly to reaffirm it, but to seek by all means in their power to bring back the Lord's people to its apprehension and acceptance. The precious doctrine of Christ's second personal appearing has, we are constrained to believe, long lain under such neglect and misapprehension."

Throughout the proceedings there was the specious presentation of the belief in the second Advent as identical with the belief in the Premillennial advent, and probably for this reason the arrogant claim that Premillenarians were in accord with the ancient Church and the Reformers. Thus Dr. Kellogg, in his paper entitled: "Christ's Coming—Is it Premillennial?"

"As the history of this doctrine is to be presented in another paper, we need only to remark on this occasion that the doctrine which has been argued in this paper, according to the uniform testimony of the best church historians, was the doctrine of the primitive Church. In the first two centuries of the Church's history, centuries distinguished above all others for their record of evangelistic zeal and activity, there is not the slightest hint that the Church was expecting any general conversion of the world to follow as the result of her glorious labors and sufferings. A careful comparison of Scripture with Scripture brings us out in accord with the

practical belief of the whole primitive Church. Ought not this, whatever difficulties through our ignorance of the future may still remain, to lead us to accept the results of that exegesis? Are we not, therefore, bound to conclude that the Advent of the Lord is to be regarded by us always as immediately impending, and, therefore, that we are not at liberty to interpose between the present and that event any period of time which shall make the Coming of the Lord in our own day a thing impossible? And if this be not a popular doctrine in the boasting and self-sufficient age in which we live, if, which is still harder in taking this position, we are compelled to differ with the many Christian brethren and profound students of the Word of God who are by us, none the less for this difference of opinion, honored and beloved in in Christ Jesus, yet it may help us to remember that for all that we stand with such men in the Church as Martin Luther, Rutherford, Latimer, with a large part of the divines of the venerable Westminster Assembly, and many others of equal standing in the Church of Christ."

Dr. Duffield, in his "Review of the General Subject," says:

"The Apostolic Church was Pre-Millennian, as was the Church for more than two centuries immediately succeeding the Apostles.

"The doctine of a Millennium before the Advent is not to be found in the standards of any of the Churches of the Reformation. By several of the Confessions, as well as by the prominent reformers individually, it was expressly repudiated. It is a novelty in the history of the Church, suggested only one hundred and fifty years ago, and avowed by its author as "a new hypothesis."

Dr. West, in his "History of the Premillenarian doctrine," claims "that a true Christian Chiliasm was the orthodox faith of the primitive Church in its purest days;" and Dr. Brooks speaks of the "Post-Millennial heresy."

The Conference, on adjourning, appointed a large committee to represent it: "Attending to the transaction of any unfinished business, and to take such action as they may deem expedient in the calling of any future meeting."

In view of such statements and projects as these, by men well known in the churches, Christian scholars are called upon once more to meet this ancient and oft exploded error on the historic ground.

This Conference reminds us of another called, but not held, by the Fifth Monarchy men in the times of the British Commonwealth, the language of the call having the same style and spirit as that quoted above: *e. g.*

"Now finding this the present truth so much opposed by the national rulers and their clergy, yea and by some godly people and church members accounted orthodox, who cannot endure the day of the Lord's coming; we therefore are resolved, according to the presence and assistance of the Lord with us, to entertain and debate for the benefit of all others, touching the premises: viz., of the laws, subjects, extent, rise, time, place, offices and officers of the Fifth Monarchy or kingdom whereby the world must be governed according to the word of God, without the mixture, as now is, of men's laws or inventions, whether in respect of magistracy or ministry, church or civil affairs."*

Whenever Premillenarianism has appeared in history, it has made the same audacious claims of being the only scriptural and orthodox doctrine. Comparing the Irvingite Premillenarians of modern times with the Montanist Premillenarians of the ancient Church, the late Principal Cunningham makes the following judicious remarks:

"In both there was the same assumption of superior knowledge and piety, the same compassion and contempt for those who did not embrace their views and join their party, and the same ferocious denunciations of men who actively and openly opposed their pretensions, as the enemies of God and the despisers of the Holy Ghost, and the same tone of predicting judgments upon the community because it rejected their claims."†

Prof. Kellogg says that the Premillennial advent, "according to the uniform testimony of the best church historians, was the doctrine of the primitive Church;" but Neander, the prince of church historians make a very different statement:

"What we have just said, however, is not to be so understood as if Chiliasm had ever formed a part of the general creed of the Church. Our sources of information from different parts of the Church in these early times, are too scanty

*Irvimy, Hist. Eng. Baptists, I., 259. † Hist. Theo., vi.

to enable us to say anything on this point with certainty and positiveness. Wherever we meet with Chiliasm, in Papias, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, everything goes to indicate that it was diffused from one country and from a single fountain head. We perceive a difference in the case of those churches where originally an anti-Jewish tendency prevailed; as in the Church at Rome. We find subsequently in Rome an anti-Chiliast tendency. Might not this have existed from the first, and only have been called out more openly by the opposition to Montanism? The same may be said also of an anti-Chiliastic tendency which Irenæus combats and which he expressly distinguished from the common anti-Chiliastic tendency of Gnosticism. It was natural, however, that the zealots for Chiliasm should in the outset be disposed to represent all opposition to it as savoring of Gnosticism."*

Dr. West says that "a new theory of the Millennium was the result of the fabled Labarum and the battle of Saxa Rubra and the Milvian bridge." Neander says:

"Two causes co-operated to bring about the general suppression of Chiliasm; on the one hand, the opposition to Montanism; on the other the influence of *the spirit* proceeding from the Alexandrian school." (l. c.).

Dr. Duffield says: "The Apostolic Church was Pre-millenarian as was the Church for more than two centuries immediately succeeding the apostles."

Baur, the great rival of Neander, says, speaking of the doctrinal conflicts of the second century:

"If Christianity was not to lose its peculiar and original character, it must not only hold fast to its practical and religious interests, expressing themselves in the immediate consciousness; against the transcendental speculations of the Gnostics, but also against the Chiliastic fanaticism of the Montanists destroying any possibility of a historical development, it must gain the ground on which Christianity might take a firm footing in the world."†

The prevalence of Chiliasm in the second century is admitted by all historians, but it is entirely false to say that it was the orthodox faith of the Church, and it is sheer misrep-

---

*Ch. Hist., Am. ed., I., 651. †Baur Gesch., I., 247.

resentation to say that such is the uniform testimony of the best church historians.

Leaving now the "Prophetic Conference" and the historians, we will examine the historic sources themselves, in order to ascertain the origin and history of Premillenarianism in the ancient Church.

We will first examine the earliest group of Christian writers called the apostolic fathers, in order to determine the sum total of their views with reference to the Second Advent and Eschatology; and first of all those of chief authority.

(1) Clement of Rome (93—101, B. C.) in his first and genuine epistle to the Corinthians, speaks of the soon and sudden accomplishment of God's will—of a speedy coming, (xxiii.) of a future resurrection of which God has rendered Christ the first fruits, (xxiv.) Peter has departed to the place of glory due to him, and Paul was removed from the world and gone into the holy place, (v.). Presbyters are blessed in having obtained a fruitful and perfect departure, and being without fear that any one should deprive them of the place now appointed them, (xliv). All the generations, from Adam to the present, who through the grace of God have been made perfect in love, now hold the place of the godly and will be made manifest at the inspection of the kingdom of Christ, (l.). Christians are exhorted to cry to God earnestly that they may be made partakers of His great and glorious promises, (xxxiv.), and to strive to be found in the number of those that wait for Him that they may share in His promised gifts, (xxxv.). This is the sum of the Eschatology of Clement, and not a word of a millennial kingdom.

(2). *Polycarp*, of Smyrna, (168†) teaches that God raised up Christ from the dead and gave Him glory and a throne at His right hand. To Him all things in heaven and on earth are subject. Him every spirit serves. He comes as the judge of the living and the dead. His blood will God require of those who do not believe in Him. But He that raised Him from the dead will also raise us up if we do His will and walk in His commandment, (ii.). We are before the eyes of

our Lord and Christ, and we must appear at the judgment seat of Christ and must every one give an account of himself, (vi). If we please him in this present world we shall receive also the future world, according as He promised to us that He will raise us again from the dead and that if we live worthily of Him, we shall reign together with Him, provided only we believe, (v.). The saints will judge the world in connection with the judgment of the Lord, (xi.). The apostles and martyrs are in their due place in the presence of the Lord, (ix.). He prays that God may bestow upon his readers and himself a lot and portion among his saints, (xii.). This is the sum of the Eschatology of Polycarp—there is not a word of a Premillennial advent.

(3). *Ignatius*, of Antioch, (117†) has left us, the seven genuine epistles, to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrnæans and Polycarp. The longer Greek recension is generally but an elaboration of the shorter, and does not give us any different conceptions of Eschatology from the shorter recension that we follow. The three in the Syriac version agree also in the corresponding parts.

The last times are come upou us. Let us stand in awe of the wrath to come or show regard for the grace which is at present displayed, (Eph. xi.). False teachers shall go away into everlasting fire, (Eph, xvi.). All things have an end, these two things are simultaneously set before us, death and life, and every one shall go unto his own place, (Mag. v.). The prophets waited for Christ and He being come raised them from the dead, (Mag. ix.). Christ hath breathed immortality into his Church, (Eph. xvii.). Christians are stones of the temple of the Father prepared for the building of God the Father, and drawn up on high by the instrument of Jesus Christ, which is the cross making use of the Holy Spirit as a rope, while their faith is the means by which they ascended and their love the way which led up to God, (Eph. ix.). The one and same bread which we break is the medicine of immortality and the antidote to prevent from dying, that we should live forever in Jesus Christ, (Eph. xx.). Be-

lieving in Christ's death we may escape from death, (Trall. ii.). In whom if we live we shall at last be found, (id. ii.). "The prize set before us is immortality and eternal life, (Poly. ii.). He desires to be found at the feet of the holy martyred and deservedly most happy Paul when he shall attain unto God, (Eph. xii.). He who is near to the sword is near to God, and he that is among wild beasts is in company with God, provided only he be so in the name of Jesus Christ, (Smyr. iv.). His love has been crucified and there is within him a living water that speaketh, saying to him inwardly: Come to the Father, (Rom. vii.). It is good to set from the world unto God that I may rise again to him, (Rom. ii.). When I suffer I shall be the freedman of Jesus and shall rise emancipated in him, (id. iv.). Suffer me to become food for the wild beasts through whose instrumentality it will be granted me to attain to God, (id. iv.). Let all the dreadful torments of the devil come upon me, only let me attain to Jesus Christ, (id. v.). Him I seek who died for us; Him I desire who rose again for our sake. Do not hinder me from living, do not wish to keep me in a state of death, and while I desire to belong to God do not give me over to the world. Suffer me to attain pure light, when I have gone thither I shall indeed be a man of God, (id. vi.). After the same manner as His Father quickened Christ, He will so raise up those who believe in Him by Christ Jesus, apart from whom we do not possess the true life.

We may add two passages from the larger Greek recension bringing out more prominently two points. "Christ will come at the end of the world with the Father's glory to judge the living and the dead and to render to every one according to his works, (Magn. xi.). He descended into Hades alone, but He arose accompanied by a multitude and rent assunder that means of separation which had existed from the beginning of the world and cast down its partition walls." There is an intense longing to be with Christ and God in these fervid epistles, but no expectation of a millennial kingdom.

These three Christian writers of the first rank are indeed on a different Eschatological line of thought from that which

led to Premillenarianism. They regard the advent as imminent, as in order to judgment, preceded by the resurrection. They recognize Christ as their king, and His kingdom as spiritual and desire to depart to be with Him.

There are numerous writings of the second rank from the early part of the second century, generally given with the works of the apostolic fathers, only two of which have the slightest traces of Premillenarianism. Those that are not Premillenarian but essentially of the same line of Eschatology, as the former group are. (1.) The *Pastor of Hermas*, (100–150.) The Church is compared to a tower composed of living stones, fitted exactly to each other, apostles, bishops, &c., some having fallen asleep and some remaining alive, (ii. 5). The tower is yet building. When it is finished and built, then comes the end and it will soon be finished (ii. 8.). A great tribulation is coming, (iv. 2). The world in which we dwell must perish through blood and fire. There is an age to come in which the elect of God will dwell, since those elected by God will be spotless and pure, (iv. 3). The servants of God dwell in a strange land, their city is far away from this one, (Sim. 1). The coming world is the summer of the righteous, but the winter of sinners. When therefore the mercy of the Lord shines forth, then shall they be made manifest who are the servants of God, and all men shall be made manifest. For the sinners shall be consumed because they sinned and did not repent, and the heathen shall be burned because they knew not Him who created them. Do ye, therefore, bear fruit that in that summer your fruit may be known, (Sim. iv. 1). The Master's absence from home is the time that remains until His appearing, (Sim. iv. 5). The 9th Sim. is of the Church or kingdom of God as a tower in building. It is built on a rock which is Christ, and entered by a gate which is Christ. Those who would enter must repent, have the seal of baptism, bear the name of Christ and be clothed with Christian graces. We observe that Hermas, who would be likely to lay great stress upon the Millennium if he had been a Premillenarian, takes an entirely different direction in his

symbolism, using it with reference to the militant Church and the growing kingdom prior to the Advent which he regards as near.

(2) The *doctrine of Addai*, one of the seventy, by his disciple Labubna, from the Syriac, regarded as genuine by Phillips, Bickel, and the best Syriac scholars. "Christ was crucified and descended to the house of the dead, and cleaved the wall of partition which had never been cleft, and gave life to the dead by being Himself slain and descended by Himself and ascended with many to His glorious Father, with whom He was from eternity one.* Christ has gone to prepare for His worshipers blessed mansions in which they may dwell (p. 43). All the souls of men which depart from the body die not, but they live and rise and have mansions and a dwelling place of rest, for the understanding and the intelligence of the soul do not cease because the image of God is represented in it, which dieth not. For it is not as the body without feeling, which perceives not the odious corruption which has come upon it. Reward and recompense it is not able to receive without it, because that labour was not its only, but also of the body in which it dwelt. (p. 45). Christ the King's son has gone to receive a kingdom and to return and to come and make a resurrection for all men: and then He sitteth on the throne of righteousness and judgeth the dead and the living. (p. 40). In the day of our Lord before the judgment seat of righteousness there will He return to us the inheritance." (p. 45). All this is in accordance with the epistles of Paul without any conception of two resurrections, or two judgments, as the Premillenarians teach.

Besides these we have the second epistle ascribed to Clement, but really a homily, by an unknown writer of the second century; the doubtful martyrdoms of Polycarp and Ignatius, which are of the same type as those given above.

We have quoted these fundamental Christian writings freely, in order that it may be seen that they not only show no traces of Chiliasm, but exhibit an entirely different type

---

*Phillips' edition, p. 9; see also p. 18.

of Eschatology. They look for the speedy advent, and in connection with it, an universal resurrection and a general judgment. They lay stress upon the blessedness of departing from this world to be with Christ, rather than upon the advent of Christ to this world to be with His people. They recognize Christ as their King, and His kingdom as spiritual and heavenly, and themselves as His subjects and servants, who must be faithful in their work of building up His Church and completing it before He comes, for He will come to judgment, to destroy anti-Christ, to reward His servants, and punish the unbelieving.*

The epistle of Barnabas, by an unknown Alexandrian Christian Jew of that name of the early part of the second century (probably), teaches that in six days, that is six thousand years, all things will be finished. The Son of God will come again, and destroy the time of the wicked one, and judge the ungodly, and change the sun and the moon and the stars, then shall He truly rest on the seventh day (xv.) Those who keep the judgment of the Lord, will be glorified in the kingdom of God, but he who chooseth other things, will be destroyed with his works. On this account there will be a resurrection, on this account a retribution. For the day is at hand in which all things shall perish with the evil one. The Lord is near and his reward (xxi.). He quotes from the book of Enoch and Daniel to show that the final stumbling-block, without respect of persons. Each will receive as he has done; Anti-Christ, is near (iv.). The Lord will judge the world if he be righteous, his righteousness will precede him, if he is wicked, the reward of wickedness is before him (iv.). The seventh day will be followed by an eighth day, the beginning of a new world (xv.).

It is evident that here the Advent is essentially an Advent for judgment, to be followed by a Sabbath of rest. The two

*In view of these facts it is most absurd for Dr. Seiss, (The Last Times, p. 384–5) to claim Polycarp and Hermas as Premillenarian—for they are the least likely to have held these views, their Eschatology being of an entirely opposite type, in the line of the subsequent school of Alexandria.

classes are placed over against one another, in accordance with the orthodox (New Testament) idea of a general judgment and general resurrection; and they are not separated by an interval of a thousand years and two distinct resurrections. There is nothing about the reign of Christ on earth in a Millennial kingdom, but only of a Millennial Sabbath, in accordance with the Jewish rabbins of that period, an idea common to Postmillenarian and Premillenarian theologians, and indeed to various religions. He quotes the Apocryphal books of Enoch and iv. Ezra, with Daniel, but makes no use whatever of the Apocalypse. Müller (Erklärung des Barnabasbriefes Exkurs. zu xv. 5; see also Nicolas, des Doctrines Religieuses des Juifs, p. 303, seq.), thinks that these notions were derived from the influence of Parsism upon both the Hellenistic and Palestinian Jews, and hence their appearance both among the Gnostics and Ebionites. At all events, we are hardly justified in concluding, from his idea of the Sabbath Millennium, that he held the views subsequently understood as Chiliasm and Premillenarianism; for he seems to teach that the advent was accompaned by a universal resurrection and general judgment, and that this was followed by a seventh day, a Millennium of earthly rest, and this by an eighth eternal day in a new world—a conception entirely different both from that of the Apocalypse and the Chiliasts.

Papias is indeed the only Premillenarian of the earliest group of Christian writers. From him we have but a few fragments, cited by Irenæus and Eusebius, and he may be slightly misrepresented. He is regarded by Eusebius as a man who, though most learned and well acquainted with the Scriptures, was yet of very limited comprehension, not understanding correctly those things which the apostolic narratives presented in a mystical form; and yet he was the cause of the later prevalence of the Chiliastic error.

Eusebius (iii. 39) says that Papias taught:

"There will be a Millennium after the resurrection of the dead, when the personal reign of Christ will be established on this earth."

Irenæus (adv. Hær., v. 33) cites him as saying on the authority of certain disciples of the Lord, Aristion and the presbyter John that our Lord taught,

"The days will come in which vines shall grow having each 10,000 branches, and in each branch 10,000 twigs, and in each twig 10,000 shoots, and in every one of the shoots 10,000 clusters, and on every one of the clusters 10,000 grapes, and every grape when pressed will give twenty-five metretes of wine. And when any one of the saints shall lay hold of a cluster, another shall cry out 'I am a better cluster; take me. Bless the Lord through me.' In like manner (he said), that a grain of wheat would produce 10,000 ears, and that every ear would have 10,000 grains, and every grain would yield ten pounds of clear, pure, fine flour, and that apples and seeds and grasses would produce in similar proportion, and that all animals feeding then only on the productions of the earth, would become peaceable and harmonious, and be in perfect subjection to man."

Such puerilities, it is safe to say, our Saviour never uttered. There is nothing of the kind in any of the Gospels, or in the style and methods of our Lord's teachings. We find almost identical language, where we would most naturally expect it, in those extravagant Jewish and Ebionite Apocalypses of the period. Thus the Apocalypse of Baruch (attributed by Schürer, Drummond, &c., to the latter part of the first or early part of the second century) says:*

"After the Messiah is revealed the earth shall yield its fruits, one producing ten thousand, and in one vine shall be a thousand bunches, and one bunch shall produce one thousand grapes, and one grape shall produce a measure of wine. And those who have been hungry shall rejoice, and they shall again see prodigies every day. For spirits shall go forth from my sight to bring every morning the fragrance of spices, and at the end of the day clouds dropping the dew of health. And it shall come to pass, at that time, the treasure

*This long lost work was given to the modern Church by Ceriani, who published a Latin translation in 1866, and the Syriac text in 1871; see his Monumenta Sacra et Prof., tom. 1, fasc ii., and tom. 5, fasc ii. It has not been used as yet by the Church Historians. See Schürer Neutest. Zeitgeschichte s. 512 folg., and Drummond's Jewish Messiah, p. 117 seq.

of manna shall again descend from above, and they shall eat of it in these years. And wild beasts shall come from the forest and minister to men, and asps and dragons shall come out of their holes to subject themselves to a little child," (xxix.).

Similar ideas occur in iv. Ezra, and the Book of Jubilees, and the Jewish rabbins. Who can fail to see, that here in this class of writings we have the historic source of early Chiliasm and later Premillenarianism, and not in the genuine Christian doctrine of the class of writings that we have previously referred to? Who can fail to give their assent to Schürer's (the very highest authority on this subject) judgment? "The dreams of Papias respecting the millennial kingdom were derived from the Apocalypse of Baruch."

The idea of the 1000 years of the Apocalypse was prepared by the seventy years of Jeremiah, xxix. 10, and the seventy sacred weeks of Dan., ix. 24, neither of which can be taken as exact historical numbers, without a straining and stretching that does violence to history on the one hand and faith on the other. They are symbolical numbers of sacred times known to God, and revealed so far as to show that God has His definite plans and times for the accomplishment of His purpose, but purposely concealed as sacred and insoluble mysteries from all creatures, so far as any calculation of them is concerned. The Jewish apocalypses, however, use these and other numbers elaborating them in the greatest variety of methods. The book of *Enoch*, attributed by Dillman, in this part, to the second Cent. B. C., lxxxix, 59 seq., represents seventy shepherds as having charge of the flock of Israel from the destruction of Jerusalem to the judgment, when they are cast into the abyss of fire. They are subdivided into 12+46+12, somewhat as Daniel's seventy weeks. Again x., 12 seq., the angels who seduced the daughters of men (Gen. iv. 4.), are bound under the earth for seventy generations, until the final judgment, when they go into the fiery abyss, and the blessedness of the earth follows. In xci. 12–17 and xciii., the duration of the world is ten weeks of seven generations each—seventy. Seven of these be-

long to the past, three to the future. The eighth week will be a time of the supremacy of righteousness, the ninth of the judgment of the world, the tenth the judgment of the angels, with the production of the new heavens and earth that will endure for a multitude of weeks. These two parts are attributed by Dillmann to a later writer of the first Cent. B. C.

The Assumption of Moses, x. 29 seq., (attributed by Hilgenfeld, Mess. Jud. to 44–45, A. D.,) represents the time from the death of Moses to the judgment as two hundred and fifty jubilee periods. *The Book of Jubilees*, (Drummond, Jewish Messiah, p. 144), makes the time from the creation to the entrance of Israel into Canaan as fifty jubilees. The Sibylline Oracles (iv 47.) give eleven generations, in the tenth, according to the MSS. the judgment is to take place, in the eleventh according to the emendation of Fabricius, Bleek and most interpreters. This book probably belongs to the first Cent. A. D.

IV. *Ezra*, xiv. 11–12, (attributed by Dillmann, Schürer and Drummond to the latter part of first Cent. A. D.), divides the age of the world into twelve parts, ten of which are past. Four hundred years are given as the days of the Messiah, after which He will die and all men with Him, and the earth will remain empty for seven days, after which there will be the resurrection and judgment.

The Apocalypse of Baruch, attributed by Schürer and Drummond, to latter part of first Cent. A. D., soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, represents the length of the age by a cloud full of white and black waters, which pour down one after the other a series of twelve floods from the beginning of the world to the judgment. Eleven of these are expired; the twelfth is coming. In that time, after a little, Zion will again be built, and its oblations will again be established, and the priests will return to their ministry, and the nations will again come to glorify it; but nevertheless not fully as in the beginning. But it will come to pass after these things, there will be the ruin of many nations. Then come the final troubles and ultimate blessedness.

The Ascension of Isaiah, (ascribed by Dillman to the early

part of second Cent. A. D.), in Chap. iv., represents Berial, the angel of the world, as reigning three years, seven months, and twenty-seven days. After 1335 days the Lord will come with his angels and armies of saints from the seventh heaven, and cast Berial and his army also into Gehenna, after which will be the resurrection of the dead, the fire will consume the wicked, and they will become as if they had not been created.

The Babylonian Talmud, (Synhed. 97 a.), gives a number of views as to the duration of the world: "The age will last 6,000 years, and in 1,000 it will be destroyed; for it has been said 'And the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day.'" Another says "In 2,000 years it will lie waste; for it has been said 'He will revive us after two days, and on the third day he will raise us up, and we will live in his sight.'" Another says "Of the 6,000 years of the world, 2,000 have passed in emptiness, 2,000 of the law, and 2,000 the days of the Messiah." Another says "The age will last not less than 85 jubilees, and in the last jubilee the Son of David will come." And so we have various other views thus: (Synhed. 99 a.). The days of the Messiah will be 40 years; another, 70 years; others, 3 generations, 365 years, 400 years, 600 years, 1000 years, 2,000, 7,000, &c. Thus these numbers vary greatly, both as to their numerical power and also as to the periods—whether weeks, years, or jubilees—and finally with regard to the age of the world until the advent of the Son of David, and the duration of the reign of the Son of Joseph. (Drummond, p. 35 seq.).

In the ideas of these Apocalypses of the latter part of the first century, and the early part of the second, we find the real basis of the Millenarian views of the ancients—the distinction of the two Messiahs dating from about this period in Jewish theology, and finding expression in the Talmuds and the later Targums. (Wünsche, Leiden des Messias, S. 109).

Indeed the Jewish apocryphal literature and apocalypses show very clearly several streams of thought with reference to the whole department of Eschatology, which pass over into

the Christian Church and reappear in all History. These tendencies are rooted in radical types of human character expressed in the various races, philosophies and religious sects of mankind. They may be normal differences within the bounds of adherence to the genuine spirit of divine revelation, such as we see in the Levitical, Prophetic and Chokhma types of Old Testament Theology, and in the Petrine, Pauline and Johannean types of New Testament Theology; or they may be abnormal differences implying a departure from the genuine teachings of Scripture as in the Jewish sects of the Pharisees, Saducees, and Essenes, with all of whom our Saviour came in conflict in His fulfillment of the Old Testaments revelation. These differences were enhanced by the mingling of nationalities and religions and the contrasts between the Jewish and the Gentile spirit, giving birth to the Ebionite and Montanist Premillenarian sects on the one side and Gnosticism on the other.

The book of Enoch among the Apocalypses, in its oldest parts, maintains the genuine Biblical ground of a state of blessedness and glory subsequent to the final judgment, and that the judgment decides the ultimate lot of all men and angels, distinguishing the place of everlasting blessedness from the place of misery in the fiery abyss. II. Maccabees is also important, especially with reference to the doctrine of the resurrection and the everlasting separation (see Bretschneider Dogmatik s. 318), and so xii. 43—45, it brings into prominence Judas and his army praying for their dead companions in view of the resurrection.

Another tendency is exhibited in the writings of Philo [de Confusione iii. 348, de Abrahamo v. 342; see also Zschirner Philo ideen ü. Unsterblichkeit in Keil Analecten Bd. i. s. 107 sq., and Frisch Vergleich. den Ideen ü Unsterblichkeit in Eichhorn Bibliothek iv. 653], and of the Essenes, who in a Hellenistic and mystical fashion ignore the body and represent the soul as at death freed from the body and ascending in a series of stages into heaven, (Josephus Jewish War ii. 11). We see these views in germ in the Book of Wisdom iii. 14; iv. 10; v. 5, 16, and iv. Maccabees xviii. 23. It was proba-

bly the view of Josephus (Jewish War III. 8 : 5), who seems to hold that the righteous go at once to heaven and the wicked to Hades, and who (Antiq. xviii. 13) colors the views of the Pharisees of his time, as if they taught that there was to be a resurrection of the righteous only.

The Assumption of Isaiah (ix. 7) carries out these ideas in a Gnostic fashion, picturing seven heavens through which he ascends, and represents the annihilation of the wicked in connection with the judgment. The book of Jubilees, iii. 24, (see Schürer Zeitgeschichte s. 462) represents the soul as immortal without bodily resurrection; and the Test. of the xii. Patriarchs (in Levi, see Stuart on Apocalypse, vol. i., p. 108), is similar in its ideas to the Ascension of Isaiah. These views were represented in the Gnostic sects and in some of the Christian writers having a tendency to Gnosticism.

Another tendency is exhibited in Pharisaism, especially of the more carnal, political, and radical type, such as prevailed in the first century A. D. This spirit laid stress upon the royal office of the Messiah, His earthly reign, the supremacy of Israel over the nations. Even the earlier Targums show this decline from the general spirit of the Old Testament, (Langen das Judenthum in Palestina zur Zeit Jesus, s. 430). We meet with it constantly in the Gospels; in those men who would constrain Jesus to be king (John vi. 15), in the carnal hopes of his own disciples which it seemed so difficult to overcome, (Matt. xx. 20—28; Acts i. 6—8), in His own stoutly resisted temptation to fulfil the hopes of the sign loving people, (Luke iv. 9—12). This tendency reached its climax in those zealots who brought on the destruction of Jerusalem (Geiger, Judaism and its History, Lect. ix.), and who followed the various rebels and false Messiahs, culminating in Bar Kochba and the exterminating war of Hadrian.

These carnal hopes of the more radical Jews, after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, find embodiment in a more scholastic form in the Apocalypse of Baruch and iv. Ezra; (Langen, s. 456, 502), which however lay more stress upon the judicial character of the Messiah as introducing the kingdom on earth. This same spirit passed over into the Chris-

tian Church through the Jewish Christian converts, and found expression in the carnal views of the Ebionites.

Caius of Rome, (Eusebius Eccle. Hist., iii., 28), charges Cerinthus, the arch-heretic, with the origination of this doctrine of the kingdom of Christ on earth after the resurrection, and the fleshly dwelling in Jerusalem; and he is doubtless correct, so far as Cerinthus is the representative of a large class of Ebionites and Gnostics. Their origin in the Christian Church is from the false spirit that issued from perverted Judaism, and passed over through Jewish converts to disturb the early Church with a similar class of heresies to those appearing already in the New Testament writings from the same sources, giving the apostles themselves endless trouble. They had thrown off the exterior crust of Judaism, but had not appropriated the essential spirit of Christianity. Those men of Corinth and Galatia, who claimed superior orthodoxy to the Apostle Paul, are the historical progenitors of Cerinthus and Papias, and their followers in all ages, who propose, with the men of the late Conference, to bring back the Church to what they claim to be "vital doctrine."

Of the second group of Christian writers, called the Apologists, only Justin can be regarded as a Chiliast. The epistle to Diognetus, one of the finest as well as earliest specimens of apology, by an unknown writer, teaches that "God will send His Son to judge us, and who shall endure His appearing. Christians dwell in their own country as sojourners. Every land of their birth is as a land of strangers. They are in the flesh but do not live after the flesh. They pass their days on earth, but they are citizens of heaven. They are put to death and restored to life, (v.). He knows nothing of a millennial kingdom. Nor do Athenagoras, Theophilus or Tatian,* in their apologies, nor Hermias, Hegesippus, Dionysius of Corinth, Melito† of Sardis, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, in any of

*Tatian is claimed by Dr. Seiss on the ground that he was a disciple of Justin. But his works exhibit a tendency to the opposite Eschatology of Gnosticism, which soon reached its climax in his organization of a peculiar Gnostic sect.

†Melito is also claimed by Dr. Seiss on the authority of Gennadius

their fragments or citations from them, or references to them, in the early writers. They with the Apostolic Fathers are of an altogether different type in their eschatology from the Millenarians. We have therefore only to consider Justin.

Justin in his apologies knows nothing of the millennial kingdom, but is in accord with the genuine Christian tradition, thus in lii.:

"The prophets have proclaimed two advents of His; the one, that which is already past, when He came a dishonored and suffering man; but the second, when according to prophecy, He shall come from heaven with glory accompanied by His angelic hosts, *when also He shall raise the bodies of all men who have lived*, and shall clothe those of the worthy with immortality, and shall send those of the wicked, endued with eternal sensibility, into everlasting fire with the wicked devils."

So also generally in his dialogue with Trypho, (xlv.):

"Christ submitted to become incarnate, and be born of this virgin of the family of David, in order that, by this dispensation, the *serpent that sinned from the beginning, and the angels like him, may be destroyed, and that death may be contemned and forever quit* at the second coming of the Christ Himself—those who believe in Him and live acceptably—and *be no more*, when some are sent to be punished unceasingly into judgment and condemnation of fire; but others shall exists in freedom from suffering, from corruption, and from grief, and in immortality."

(de Dogm. Eccl., c. 52), but Gennadius says nothing about him in chap. 52, but in chap. 55 the following: "In divinis promissionibus nihil terrenum vel transitorium exspectemus, sicut Melitani sperant. Non nuptiarum copalum, sicut Cerinthus et Marcion delirant. Non quod ad cibum vel ad potum pertinet, sicut Papia auctore, Irenæus, et Tertullianus, et Lactantius acquiescunt." There is no evidence that the Melitians derived their views from this father Melito and Gennadius does not impute to them Chiliasm, but simply carnal views with reference to the future of the earth, which may or may not have been connected with the millennium. Indeed, as Steitz in his valuable article in Herzog Real-Encyclopædia, ix. 314, shows, that as an exegete he employed the allegorical and typical methods of interpretation over against the narrowness and literalism of the Jewish Christian spirit. There is not the slightest evidence that he was a Premillenarian.

So also in xlix.: "The other advent in which He will *come glorious and judge of all.*"

Again in cxiii., comparing Joshua with Christ:

"For the former gave them a temporary inheritance in the holy land, but the *latter, after the holy resurrection, shall give us the eternal possession.* The latter is He after whom and by whom the Father will renew both the heaven and the earth; this is He who shall shine an *eternal light in Jerusalem*; this is He who is the King of Salem after the order of Melchizedek, and the eternal Priest of the Most High."

These ideas as expressed especially in those passages we have emphasized—of an advent for universal judgment, to destroy the devil and his angels, and death itself, to give an eternal possession of the holy land to his people, and be the eternal light in Jerusalem—are in accordance with the orthodox tradition, and not in accord with Premillenarianism.

And yet in his dialogue with Trypho (lxxx.) Justin says:

"I and others who are right minded Christians in all points, are assured that there will be a resurrection of the dead, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be built and adorned and enlarged as the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and others declare."

In the previous context he has declared the idea that "there is no resurrection of the dead, and that their souls, when they die, are taken to heaven," to be un-Christian. This Gnostic notion he opposes, with the idea of the resurrection of the dead and a thousand years of the saints in Jerusalem. This might most easily be interpreted in accordance with the passage quoted above (cxiii.) regarding the one thousand years as the symbol of eternity—as Ephraim Syrus and Urbanus Rhegius, and other opponents of Chiliasm—during which the saints have *eternal possession of the Holy Land, and Christ shines an eternal light in Jerusalem.*

But the difficulty is that in chapter lxxxi., after citing from Isaiah lv. 7 (passages relating to the new heavens and new earth) and Psalm xc., he refers to Rev. xx., representing John as saying:

"That those who believe in our Christ would dwell a thou-

sand years in Jerusalem, and that thereafter the general, and in short the eternal, resurrection and judgment of all men would likewise take place."

This single passage, quoted loosely from the Apocalypse, is the sum total of the Chiliasm of Justin, and is in manifest contradiction with the several passages cited above. Donaldson, in his valuable work on the Apologists, (p. 262.) says:

"This one extract is the only passage that gives us information that Justin knew of two resurrections. He does not say that he agreed with the opinion, but he could scarcely help giving his assent to an Apostle."

He also suggests the alternative of an interpolation. It is certainly noteworthy that, so far as we know, Eusebius, Irenæus, and Tertullian make no mention of the Chiliasm of Justin. Still further, Jerome gives us three lists of early Chiliasts. In his catalogue of writers, speaking of Papias, he mentions him as a Chiliast, and that he was followed by Irenæus and Apollinarius, and others among the Greeks. He thus passes over Justin. He also gives the Latins—Tertullian, Lactantius, and Victorinus. So in his Commentary on Isaiah lxv., he gives the same names. In his Commentary on Ezekiel, xxxvi., after mentioning the same Latins as in the previous lists, with the addition of a certain Severus, he says "*Et ut Græcos nominem et primum extremumque, conjungam Irenæus et Apollinarius,*" Surely this threefold omission is significant, in view of the leading position of Justin among the apologists. How shall we explain it?

Semisch, in his confused and ill-adjusted treatment of this subject, has misled not few of our late historians and theologians. Engelhardt, in his recent work Justin der Martyr, 1878, s. 307), better appreciates the situation. He remarks that

"We must distinguish the Chiliasm of the heathen Christians from the Chiliasm of the Jewish Christians. That of the heathen Christians bore the seeds of death in itself, and must come to an end, not on account of a worldly conformity of the Church or a conflict with spiritual conceptions, but sim-

ply because the Millennium seems aimless after the Christian Church has declared itself to be the true Israel."

The Chiliasm of Justin has thus a slender foundation in a misquoted and misunderstood passage of the Apocalypse, without any note or comment on his part. It cannot outweigh the numerous passages giving his own orthodox statements. It may be that following the lead of Donaldson and Engelhardt, we may arrive at some such conclusion as this: that Justin in his true conception of the second advent with its general resurrection and judgment, followed by everlasting blessedness in the New Jerusalem, could not overcome the passage, Rev. xx., which seemed to teach differently. He could not but cite it in all honesty, but he fails to explain it leaving the inconsistency unsolved. This is preferable to the alternative that we must suppose Justin to have involved himself in those inconsistencies to which Premillenarians are peculiarly liable.

At all events, it is not enough to build on Justin alone of the Apologists, and Papias alone of the Apostolic Fathers, any theory as to the orthodoxy or prevalence of Chiliasm in those early times; his words, "I and others who are right-minded on all points are assured that there will be a resurrection of the dead, and a thousand years in Jerusalem," &c., amount to scarcely more than the language of that body of theologians who came up to the late "Prophetic Conference," proposed to "bring back" the Lord's people "to *a vital doctrine of God's Word.*"

We have now come to a third group of writers, the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Among these some strong men were advocates of Chiliasm in its various forms, but as Neander says, "It all points to a spreading from one region and out of one source."

Irenæus is the earliest and indeed the most important of them all, on account of his general orthodoxy and soundness of judgment; but he was misled by Papias, whom he highly esteemed, and whom he quotes not only in the passage given in connection with Papias (Adv. Hær. v. 33), and shown to be connected with the Apocalypse of Baruch, but also an-

other no less gross one (v. 36) of the same style,* probably from the same source. He also quotes from the apocryphal book of Baruch, iv. 36 and v. (as if from Jeremiah), as well as from the Apocalypse of John, the Prophets and Gospels. If we could regard Irenæus as adopting all the ideas that he cites from these extra biblical sources, we should charge him with being one of the grosser sort of Chiliasts, but inasmuch as his own language is moderate, we would rather conclude that he was striving to adapt Chiliasm to the orthodox Christian faith by making the Millennium introductory and preparatory to the highest state of glory in heaven; thus (v. 32—35):

"It behooves the righteous first to receive the promise of the inheritance which God promised to the fathers, and to reign in it, when they rise again to behold God in this creation which is renovated, and that the judgment should take place afterwards. For it is just that in that very creation in which they toiled or were afflicted, being proved in every way by suffering, they should receive the reward of suffering; and that in the creation in which they were slain because of their love to God, in that they should be revived again; and that in the creation in which they endured servitude, in that they

*"As the Presbyters say, then those who are deemed worthy of an abode in heaven shall go there, others shall enjoy the delights of Paradise, and others shall possess the splendors of the city; for everywhere the Saviour will be seen, according as they shall be worthy who see Him. But that there is this distinction between the habitation of those who produce an hundred fold, and that of those who produce sixty fold and that of those who produce thirty fold; for the first will be taken up into the heavens, the second class will dwell in Paradise and the last will inhabit the city, and that on this account the Lord said: 'In my Father's house are many mansions,' for all things belong to God, who supplies all with suitable dwellings, even as His word saith, that a share is given to all by the Father, according as each one is or shall be worthy. And this is the couch on which they shall recline who feast, being invited to the wedding. The presbyters, the disciples of the apostles say, that this is the gradation and arrangement of those who are saved; and that they advance through steps of this nature; and that moreover they ascend through the Spirit to the Son, and through the Son to the Father, and in due time the Son will yield up His work to the Father, as it is said by the apostle, 1 Cor. xv. 25."

should reign. For God is rich in all things, and all things are His. It is fitting, therefore, that the creation itself, being restored to its primæval condition, should without restraint be under the dominion of the righteous."

"In the times of the kingdom the earth has been called by Christ [to its pristine condition], and Jerusalem rebuilt after the pattern of the Jerusalem above. In the Apocalypse John saw this city descending upon the new earth. This is after the times of the kingdom, when there will be a general resurrection and judgment of the dead, great and small. Of this Jerusalem the former one is an image, that Jerusalem of the former earth in which the righteous are disciplined beforehand for incorruption, and prepared for salvation. As man rises actually, so also shall he be actually disciplined beforehand for incorruption, and shall go forward and flourish in the times of the kingdom, in order that he may be capable of receiving the glory of the Father. Then, when all things are made new, he shall truly dwell in the city of God."

Irenæus thus makes the main purpose of the Millennium to be ethical, in disciplining and preparing the risen saints for heaven. Ziegler calls attention to the fact that Irenæus does not believe in the conflict of Satan at the close of the Millennium, and does not cite the Apocalypse in this regard. His strong opposition to Gnosticism, the ethical preparation of souls after death, the spiritual resurrection to heaven, the allegorizing method of interpreting the Scriptures, inclined him to the other extreme of literalism in interpretation, an undue emphasis of the physical, a postponement of the ethical preparation until the Millennium, and of the ascent of souls to heaven until after the Millennium.

As the Chiliasm of Irenæus was derived from Papias and modified by him, so it was transmitted in a moderate form to his disciple Hippolytus. (Com. in Daniel, Rom. 1772, p. 99).

The other great theologian who adopted the Chiliast theory was Tertullian, who derived it together with his other Montanist notions from Asia Minor—the fruitful source of early heresies. Thus he quotes from this new prophecy as if it were of equal authority with the Apocalypse of John and the Hebrew Prophets, (adv. Marcion iii. 24).

"As for the restoration of Judea, however, which even the

Jews themselves, induced by the names of places and countries, hope for just as it is described, it would be tedious to state at length how the figurative interpretation is spiritually applied to Christ and His Church, and to the character and fruits thereof, besides the subject has been regularly treated in another work which we have entitled *de spe Fidelium*. We do confess that a kingdom is promised to us upon the the earth, although before heaven, only in another state of existence; inasmuch as it will be after the resurrection, for a thousand years, in the divinely built city of Jerusalem, 'let down from heaven,' which the Apostle calls 'our mother from above,' and while declaring that 'our citizenship is in heaven,' he predicted of it that it is really a city in heaven. This both Ezekiel had knowledge of, and the apostle John beheld. And the word of the new prophecy, which is a part of our belief (Montanist), attests how it is foretold that there would be for a sign, a picture of this very city exhibited to view previous to its manifestation. This prophecy indeed has been very lately fulfilled in an expedition to the East. For it is evident, from the testimony of even heathen witnesses, that in Judæa there was suspended in the sky a city, early every morning for forty days. As the day advanced, the entire figure of its walls would wane gradually, and sometimes it would vanish instantly. We see that this city has been provided by God for receiving the saints on their resurrection, and refreshing them with the abundance of all really spiritual blessings, as a recompense for those which in the world which we have either despised or lost; since it is both just and God-worthy that His servants should have their joy in the place where they have also suffered affliction for his name's sake. Of the heavenly kingdom this is the process; After its 1,000 years are over, within which period is completed the resurrection of the saints, who rise sooner or later, according to their deserts, there will then ensue the destruction of the world, and the conflagration of all things at the judgment; we shall then be changed in a moment into the substance of angels, even by the investiture of an incorruptible nature, and so be removed to that kingdom of heaven."

His work, *de spe Fidelium*, has been lost but the above sufficiently proves that Tertullian's Chiliasm is of a Montanistic type. As Montanism with its new Prophecy and holy place of Pepuza was at once treated by the Church as heresy, Tertullian will hardly be claimed as a pillar of orthodoxy in

this particular. From Tertullian, Chilasm was transmitted in a still more sensuous form to Commodian,* and Lactantius probably; although Lactantius seems to have leaned more upon the Sibylline prophecies than those of the Word of God or any Christian writer; thus Institutes vii. 24. (Comp. Epitome lxxi.–lxxii.).

"When He shall have destroyed unrighteousness, and executed His great judgment, and shall have recalled to life the righteous who have lived from the beginning, will be enjoyed among men a thousand years, and he will rule them with most just command. They who shall be alive in their bodies shall not die, but during those 1,000 years shall produce an infinite multitude, and their offspring shall be holy and beloved of God; but they who shall be raised from the dead shall preside over the living as judges. But the nations shall not be entirely extinguished, but some shall be left as a victory for God, that they may be subjected to perpetual slavery. About the same time, also, the prince of the devils, who is contriver of all evil, shall be bound with chains, and shall be imprisoned during the 1,000 years of the heavenly rule in which righteousness shall reign in the world, so that he may contrive no evil against the people of God. After His coming the righteous shall be collected from all the earth, and the judgment being completed, the sacred city shall be planted in the middle of the earth, in which God himself, the builder, may dwell together with the righteous, bearing rule in it, and the Sibyl marks out this city when he says: "And the city which God made, this He made more brilliant than the stars, and the sun and the moon."

"I have already shown above that when 6000 years shall be completed this change must take place, and that the last day of the extreme conclusion is now drawing near. All expectation does not exceed the limit of 200 years. The subject itself declares that the fall and ruin of the world will

---

* Second half of third Cent., (see his poem entitled *Instructiones adv. gentium deos*, 43–44):

"From heaven will descend the city in the first resurrection; this is what we may tell of such a celestial fabric. We shall rise again to Him, who have been devoted to Him. And they shall be incorruptible, even already living without death. And neither will there be any grief nor any groaning in that city. They shall come also who overcame cruel martyrdom under Anti-Christ, and they themselves live for the whole time and receive blessings because they suffered evil things; and they themselves marrying, beget for a thousand years."

shortly take place, except that while the city of Rome remains, it appears that nothing of the kind is to be feared. But when that capital of the world shall have fallen, and shall have begun to be a street, which the Sibyls say shall come to pass, who can doubt that the end has now arrived to the affairs of men and the whole world."

Lactantius is valued for the purity of his style, having been called the Christian Cicero, but as a theologian he is of trifling importance. Alzog, (Patrologie, s. 214), says of him:

"He accomplished little in the development of Christian doctrine, is inaccurate, and falls into many errors, since he lacks a deeper insight into dogma, and its precise statement. Hence Jerome expresses the wish: '*Utinam tam nostra confirmare potuisset, quam facile aliena destruxit.*' His most important errors are found in the doctrine of the Logos, where there is a confused subordinationism, as well as of the Holy Ghost. With regard to the last, Jerome charges that he denied the substance of the Holy Ghost (the personality peculiar to him), *errore judaico.*"

Schwane, (Dogmengeschichte, s. 408), says of all these men:

"They attributed to souls after death a position of subordinate blessedness. Irenæus and Tertullian made an exception of the martyrs, and admitted them at once to the vision of God after death. The other fathers extended this to all the righteous, who have nothing more to repent of, and thereby show that they indulged in no Chiliastic expectations."

Other Ante-Nicene men have been claimed as Chiliasts without warrant: thus Cyprian, who in his Exhort. to Martyrdom, xiii., (Comp. Epist. to Moyses xv.), interprets the first resurrection of Rev. xx. 4, 5, with reference to the ascent of the spirit after death thus:

"What a dignity it is to depart gloriously in the midst of afflictions and tribulations, in a moment to close the eyes with which men and the world are looked upon, and at once to open them and look upon God and Christ. Of such a blessed departure how great is the swiftness! You shall be suddenly taken away from earth to be placed in the heavenly kingdom." "All live and reign with Christ, not only those who have been slain, but even whosoever, standing in firmness of faith, and in the fear of God, have not worshipped the

image of the beast, and have not consented to his deadly and sacrilegious edicts."

We need only compare this with the language of Tertullian given above, to see the essential difference of conception. Methodius of Tyre might be claimed with better reason, although his views differ entirely from any Chiliast's that we know of; for he teaches that the Feast of Tabernacles in the seventh month represents the seventh Millennium of rest. (Banquet of the Ten Virgins ix. 5). This is immediately after the burning of the earth and its transformation to be the abode of the redeemed who are preserved from wrath, being caught up soul and body to Christ, while the wicked are destroyed with an utter destruction by the avenging angels. (Id. ix. 1, Disc. on Resurrection, xiv.). Thus the first day of the feast is a judgment day, then follows the Millennium of rest, the true Sabbath, after which the body is changed from a human and corrupt form into angelic symmetry and beauty, and will ascend into the very house of God above the heavens. (Disc. on Res. viii., ix., and Banquet of Ten Virgins ix. 3 and 5).

Here the Millennium is but a transitional period in the advance from earth to heaven.

Victorinus of Petau is also represented as a Chiliast by Jerome, but the Commentary on Revelation that has come down to us under his name, and seems to be genuine, represents Satan as bound from the First Advent to the end of the age; the first resurrection as the spiritual resurrection of Col. iii. 1; the Millennium as representing "the completing of the number of the perfect," and the Second Advent as in majesty and glory for judgment. However the fragment *de Fabrica mundi*, ascribed to him and supposed to have been a part of his Com. on Genesis, makes the Seventh Millenary the true Sabbath when Christ with His elect will reign, and the great day of judgment the eighth day.*

---

*This apparent difference of opinion might be accounted for by a change of mind on the part of the author in passing from an earlier work on Genesis to a matured one on the Apocalypse, or he may not think here of the reign of the visible Christ or of the risen saints, but

The last quarter of the second century and the first half of the third was thus the golden age of Chiliasm. It has never had such great theologians to advocate it in any other period of history as Irenæus and Tertullian. If these could not make it orthodox, if their great names and influence could not prevent it from being branded as heresy, what hope can our modern Premillenarians have, after so many centuries, of making this ancient and long discarded error again respectable in the Church of Christ?

Its association with Montanism was fatal to it in the third century, as its suspicious origin in Jewish and Ebionite Apocalypses had been fatal to it in the second century.

Claudius Apollinaris (170–180,) bishop of Phrygia, at once opposed it in its birth-place, calling probably the earliest Provincial Synod to array the Churches of Asia against it, and we know of no subsequent writer in Asia Minor or Greece who adopted Chiliasm except Montanists.

Victor of Rome (192) wrote against them, and was followed by Caius, (220†) who traced the origin of Chiliasm to Cerinthus. The error does not appear subsequently in the Church of Rome.

The ancient school of Alexandria, the most potent in influence in the early Church, shows no trace of Chiliasm, indeed its tendencies were rather to the other extreme. Origen rebukes the Chiliasts sharply, (*De Princip.* II. 11):

"Certain persons then refusing the labor of thinking, and adopting a superficial view of the letter of the law, and yielding rather in some measure to the indulgence of their own desires and lusts, being disciples of the letter alone, are of opinion that the fulfilment of the promises of the future are to be looked for in bodily pleasure and luxury; and therefore they especially desire to have again, after the resurrection, such bodily structures as may never be without the power of eating and drinking and performing all the functions of flesh and blood, not following the opinion of the Apostole Paul,

---

of a culmination of the Church in a more blessed earthly state. We have already seen that views respecting the Millennium were as varied in the ancient church as in modern times. Scarcely any two, even among the Chiliasts were entirely agreed.

regarding the resurrection of a spiritual body. And consequently they say that after the resurrection there will be marriages and the begetting of children, imagining to themselves that the earthly city of Jerusalem is to be rebuilt."

"Such are the views of those who while believing in Christ, understand the divine Scriptures in a sort of Jewish sense, drawing from them nothing worthy of the divine promises. Those, however, who receive the representations of Scripture according to the understanding of the apostles, entertain the hope that the saints will eat indeed, but that it will be the bread of life," &c.

Dionysius the Great, (264†) finding that Chiliasm had broken out at Arsinoe, through Nepos and Korakion, went to that place, assembled a synod, convinced the errorists, so that they repented and retracted their heretical opinions, and he stamped out Millenarianism once for all in Egypt. He also wrote an elegant and elaborate work against it, (Comp. Jerome. Præf. xviii. Com. in Isaiam lxv), which was highly esteemed in ancient times, but has been lost with other treatises on this subject, pro and con, owing to the subsequent lack of interest in Millenarianism after its effectual and long-continued burial.

In the Eastern Syrian Church, Chiliasm seems never to have obtained a foothold; the teachings of Addai were maintained. The Churches of Palestine and Syria were little troubled with it, owing to the early exclusion of Ebionitism, except among the common people and obscure men, who inherited the ancient errors, although Apollinaris in the next century revived the doctrine in connection with other heresies.

Indeed looking over the Church of the third century, we find Chiliasm in a few eminent men of the first half century, all influennced by extra biblical traditions from Asia Minor; but they made it prominent only to insure its overthrow—for the mass of writers as well as Churches, speaking through their local assemblies, bishops, and patriarchs, either show an entirely different conception of eschatology, or else, as in the great Churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Asia Minor, they condemned the heresy; so that before the first Œcumenical

Council at Nice,* Chiliasm had been virtually suppressed in all parts of the Christian Church, and no one of that most august assemby of Christendom from all parts of the Church, has ever, so far as we know, been charged with the slightest taint of Millenarianism.

It is manifestly absurd for any one to claim for Premillenarianism an orthodox position in the Ante-Nicene Church, because Irenæus and Tertullian, with a few lesser lights, advocated the theory in some of its forms.† Indeed it shows a weakness of judgment and a historic pessimism to leap over sixteen Christian centuries to find in the three earliest a purer life and a sounder doctrine. The Church of Christ has not gone on from bad to worse, and worst through nineteen centuries; but with Christ, its King, at its head, and the

---

*Dr. Seiss, in "The Last Times," seventh ed. 1878, p. 395, still maintains the long exploded reference of Mede, Homes and Hartley to the Forms of doctrine given by Gelasius Cyzicenus in his history of the Council of Nice, as showing that "this doctrine of the reign of Christ with his saints stands upon the same authority as does that of the Nicene creed." But in the first place, these do not teach Chiliasm as one can see from the extract, but simply a more blessed condition on the new earth with the new heavens, which many who are not Premillenarians hold. And in the second place, as Du Pin, (nouvelle bibl. des aut. eccl., IV. p. 280) says, they are pure fiction, and as Hefele, in his history of Councils, says, they are spurious and apocryphal, "From the first no more acts of Nicæa were known than the Creed, the twenty Canons and the Synodical decree. (II. p. 263–4).

† Maitland, in his Apostolic School of Prophetic Interpretation, (p. 201) makes a table of writers who have recorded their opinion for or against the Millennium, among the Ante-Nicene men, including Barnabas, Justin, Cyprian and Victorinus in its favor, and only recognizing Origen and Dionysius as against it. This unfair classification is in order to a still more unfair presumption in which he is followed by a majority of Premillenarians, that those who have not expressed their views were Chiliasts. We might rather presume the opposite to be the case from the well known anxiety of men of that type to express their views on every possible occasion. But we have rather preferred to show the early writers treating of Eschatology, and dealing with subjects where Premillenarianism must have appeared if it were entertained by them. By strictly applying this test we observe into what a ridiculous minority they have fallen.

Holy Spirit in its heart, it has advanced in life and doctrine all along the line of the centuries, and will continue so to do until the end of the world. The best of the Ante-Nicene fathers were more or less involved in views which would be regarded as errors in later times, and we judge them leniently prior to the historic formation of doctrine in the symbols of the Churches. Indeed Christian doctrine has never depended upon the authority of certain theologians, however eminent, but primarily upon the sacred Scriptures, and secondarily upon the authoritative symbols adopted by Christian Councils, Synods, and Churches.

The Christian Church early began the work of framing symbols of faith. The earliest were the baptismal creeds given by Dr. Schaff, in his massive work on the Creeds of Christendom, (Vol. II. p. 11 sq.) from various writers, showing how they gradually assimilated into the so-called Apostles' Creed. These generally embrace a reference to the Second Advent. The earliest is from Ignatius of Antioch (107): (Epist. to Trallians ix.).

"He sits on his right hand waiting till his enemies are put under his feet."

Iranæus himself (Adv. Haer. I. 10) gives the orthodox faith in one of these formulas, showing no Premillenarianism:

"And his appearing from heaven in the glory of the Father to comprehend all things under one head, and to raise up all flesh of all mankind that according too the good pleasure of the Father invisible, every knee of those that are in heaven and on earth and under the earth should bow before Christ Jesus our Lord and God and Saviour and King, and that every one tongue should confess to him, and that he may execute righteous judgment over all; sending into eternal fire the spiritual powers of wickedness, and the angels who transgressed and apostatized, and the godless and unrighteous and lawless and blasphemous among men, and granting life and immortality and eternal glory to the righteous and holy who have both kept the Commandments and continued in his love, some from the beginning and some after their conversion."

Tertullian also: (de Praescript. Haer. xiii.).

"He will come again with glory to take the saints into the enjoyment of eternal life and the celestial promises, and to judge the wicked with eternal fire, after the resuscitation of both with the restitution of the flesh."

These formularies of faith are to be regarded as giving the views of the Churches; the Chiliasm of Tertullian and Irenæus is thus manifestly merely their individual opinions according to their own summaries of the faith of their times.

The Apostles' Creed so-called gives the orthodox view of the universal Church as to the Second Advent in the words, "*From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead,*" which is then taken up into the Nicene Creed without change, the Council of Constantinople adding the clause "*of whose kingdom there will be no end.*" So the Athanasian Creed adds to the Nicene, "*At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies* and shall give account for their own works, and they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire."* These creeds seem most effectually to exclude Premillenarian views.

Along side of the creed formation there was also a liturgical formation.† In these early liturgies in connection with the Lord's Supper we observe the remembrance of the words, "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death till He come." Thus the Clementine liturgy: (xii.).

"Being mindful, therefore, of His passion and death, and resurrection from the dead and return into the heavens, and His future second appearing wherein He is to come with glory and power to judge the quick and the dead, and to recompense to every one according to his works."

The liturgy of James also: (xiv.).

"His second glorious and awful appearing, when He shall come with glory to judge the quick and the dead, and render to every one according to his works."

---

*The meaning we see from Gennadius de eccl. dogm. vi. "Erit resurrectio mortuorum omnium hominum, sed una et insimul et simel non prima justorum, et secunda peccatorum, ut fabula est somniatorum; sed una omnium."

†See Hammond, Liturgies, Eastern and Western. Oxford, 1878.

The liturgy of Mark: (xiv.).

"His second terrible and dreadful coming in which He will come to judge righteously the quick and the dead, and to render to each man according to his works."

Thus it is manifest, that the liturgies agree with the creeds in the expectation of the second advent to universal judgment, and not to introduce a millennial kingdom. Indeed the liturgies are pervaded with the idea of Jesus, as their King, present with them in that most solemn service of the sacrament. This consolidation of Christian faith in creed and liturgy effectually excluded Chiliasm more and more from the Church, until it was finally banished for many centuries. In the martyr times, before this consolidation of doctrine, it was not unnatural that the Jewish Christian spirit should look forward to the temporal reign of Christ on earth and to a period of the supremacy of the kingdom of God over the world. The suffering Church ever longs for the triumphant Church. But when the Christian religion became dominant, and remained the supreme force on earth, it was again natural that these views and hopes should be regarded as realized in the historic Church itself. Accordingly, Millenarianism had its time and office, as Dorner says, (Enwickelungsgesch. d. Lehre von d. Person Christi, I. s., 246) representing a noble and valuable principle, which must not be ignored in its conflict with its great opponent Gnosticism. In a man like Irenæus, therefore, we can forgive it; for he does not allow himself to be misled by it into its extreme consequences, but rather strives to modify it and give it an ethical direction. He does not make it the essential thing in his theology. So long as the Christian soul embraces in its conception the one Christ of the cross, the throne, and the judgment-seat, it will correctly apprehend His glorious person and saving work; but if the enthronement of Christ is postponed till the second advent, disaster follows to all parts of the theological system; for, as Dorner (idem. I. s. 236) says, "Ebionitism stands immediately before the door, when the spirit turns to Eschatology in the narrow sense with such an unsatisfied longing, that it acts as if nothing essential had

been given or improved by the first advent of Christ, but expects everything first from His second coming. Then Christ becomes merely the Prophet of His own future, a work for which another had sufficed."

The early Christians clung to Christ, their King and Saviour, with invincible faith and ardent longing. The desire to go to His presence was stronger than the longing for the advent of the Judge; but the modern Premillenarians, in denying that Christ is enthroned, or that His kingdom is established, or that His Church, with the Holy Spirit's energy, is to convert the world; and asserting that the world will wax worse and worse until the second advent, range themselves against the historic Church of Christ, alongside of the ancient Ebionites and Montanists and the modern Irvingites and Plymouth Brethren.

We have shown that whilst Chiliasm was the individual opinion of certain ante-Nicene theologians of repute, it had its origin in Jewish and Ebionite Apocalypses, and in Montanism; that the only man of recognized orthodoxy who certainly adopted it, was Irenæus, who strove to modify the sensuous Chiliasm, and give it an ethical significance; that not only the orthodox opinion of the Church, as expressed in the eschatology of its numerous writers, baptismal creeds, and liturgies, excluded it, but that it was also rejected by the Churches of Asia Minor, Alexandria, and Rome, by authoritative and official action; so that it had no representation in the first Œcumenical Council at Nice.

The post-Nicene Church shows no trace of the heresy for twelve centuries, except in the case of Apollinaris of Laodicea (who was also a heretic in his doctrine of the person of Christ, and was excluded from the Church to form a sect of his own), *Severus and a certain heretical Syrian, Bar Sudaili men-

* Mentioned by Jerome in his Com. on Ezek. xxxvi., as expressing these views in a lost dialogue with a certain Gallus, and who is probably the same as the Sulpicius Severus, who, according to Gennadius, was led astray by the Pelagians, but afterwards repented and remained in penitential silence.

tioned below, although we should judge from Jerome that it had not yet died out among the common people in some parts.

The fathers of the Nicene and post-Nicene Church were unanimous in their rejection of Chiliasm in every form. Eusebius, in his Church History, repeatedly shows his dislike to it, and in his Theophania, iv. 35, argues against a narrow and limited conception of the Second Advent, as if it were to be visible in some corner of the earth, and refers to our Saviour's comparison of His coming to the lightning flash, and in 36–7, he teaches that the signs predicted have all been fulfilled, and it looks as if he thought, though with some uncertainty, that the end of the world had already come. (See Dr. Lee's edition, p. 282).

Cyril of Jerusalem, a man of the same type, wrote the first exposition of the Creed in a popular form, and in treating of the Second Advent, brings into decided prominence the judgment, and ignores the millennial opinion.

The school of Antioch, under the lead of the "*magister Orientis*," Theodore of Mopsuestia, with his pupils, Chrysostom and Theodoret, are of the very opposite type of eschatology to the Chiliasts. They were warm in their opposition to Apollinaris and his heresies. Theodoret (Hæretic. Fab. de Cerintho, III. and de Nepote VI.) mentions the Chiliasm of Cerinthus and Nepos only to state that it was put down by Caius of Rome and Dionysius of Alexandria.

The Eastern Syrian school would have been more likely to have favored Chiliasm, but it kept to its early traditions, under the lead of the sweet singer Ephraim, who held that the Millennium was the state of everlasting blessedness, whilst in a great variety of form and beauty of expression in his numerous hymns and metrical homilies he dwells on his favorite theme, the immediate departure of believing souls to heaven at death.*

---

* Neander, in his Church Hist., II. 556, mentions Bar Sudaili, abbot of a cloister at Edessa, in the latter part of the 5th century, who came into violent conflict with the church doctrine and was sharply assailed for his monophysitism and his doctrine of a universal restoration and of a millennium kingdom of exalted happiness on earth at the close of the earthly course of the world as a transition thereto.

The Alexandrian school ever maintained the same determined opposion to Chiliasm that we have found in Origen and Dionysius. Basil the Great (Epist. 263) sharply rebukes this fable and Jewish opinion of a resurrection to legal rites and ceremonies in Jerusalem. (See also Epiphanius adv. Hær., III. 2 (77).

But the fullest and strongest statements against this heresy are by the great fathers of the Western Church, Jerome and Augustine. Jerome, in his exegetical labors upon the prophets, constantly meets their false exegesis, and derides it as carnal, Jewish, a dream, a fable, heretical, &c. (Letter to Hedibra; Com. in Esai. xxiii.; xxx.; liv.: lviii.; lix.; lx.; Ezek. xxxvi.; Zech. ii., &c.). In one passage, (Com. Jer. xx.), however, thinking of Irenæus and some martyrs who had held the opinion, he speaks moderately against it. It shows a profound ignorance of the history and principles of exegesis to rail at the so-called "Tichonian *secundum anagogen*" (Dr. West, Hist. of the Premill. doct. at the Prophetic Conference) and ignore or abuse Origen and Jerome, for Origen and Jerome, as every exegete knows, towered like intellectual giants above the men of their times, the fathers of exegesis in the ancient Church, with none to equal them until the Reformation; and this not only as expositors of the Word of God, but also as giving the most careful attention to the original text and versions, and laying down scientific principles for its interpretation. The Hexapla of Origen is the fundamental work for Biblical criticism, and the Vulgate version of Jerome has been of far greater importance to the Christian Church than even the valuable versions of Luther and King James. That such profound Biblical scholars were so intense in their hostility to Premillenarianism is one of the weightiest arguments against it.

Jerome was followed by the entire body of exegetes, Greek and Latin, until the Reformation, in his rejection of Chiliasm and by almost all Biblical scholars till the present day. Augustine led the theologians in the same direction, and what makes his testimony all the more powerful is that, in early life under the influence of Manichäism, he had entertained

the Chiliastic error, but rejected it seeing clearly its heterodoxy and disastrous consequences, (de Civitate, xx. 7, 9). The great Father of the West was followed by the entire body of Latin Fathers and schoolmen, such as Leo the great, Gregory the great, Beda Venerabilis, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas.

For more than 1000 years there was not the slightest whisper of Premillenarianism. As Baronius says under the year 411 A. D.:

"Such follies of the Millenarians, since they were now everywhere rejected with hisses and derided by the learned with laughter, and no less condemned, were entirely extinguished, for there was no one, unless esteemed as foolish and entirely delirious, who would be exposed to ridicule by such fables."

We are aware that a Millennium of Christian history counts for nothing with Premillenarian historians. These were the dark ages of Popery—dark not because there was no light in them, for they are the heroic ages of Christendom, the ages of the conversion of Britain and Northern Europe, in which the foundations of our Christian civilization were laid; the ages of the Crusades with their Christian Chivalry and consecration; the ages of the masters of sentences; and yet they are dark as midnight to minds obscured by pessimistic prejudice, whose eyes can detect only the bad, and are unwilling to see any good except in a future Millennium. Thanks be to God that these men do not constitute the Christian Church: they are the few who give forth the discordant notes in that grand hymn of thanksgiving and praise that is constantly ascending to our Saviour and King for all His mercies to the Church and the world. We are not yet prepared to discard the great teachers of the Church or to put out the lights of Christian history. We are not disposed to adopt the suggestion of one of these Premillenarians, (Dr. Goodwin, at the late Prophetic Conference, in his address), "to burn our libraries, break through all the traditions, overturn all the schemes," and devote ourselves for life to the study of King James' version at the feet of these new lights, who take such a gloomy view of things, and give such little encouragement

for hearty labor. They remind us of the Anabaptists of the Reformation, and the Fifth Monarchy men of the English Revolution, who harped upon the same string of universal corruption and a general overturning of everything to introduce the golden times. We see their culmination in the Zion of Münster as in that of the ancient Pepuza.

ARTICLE V.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH BETWEEN THE POTOMAC AND THE RIO GRANDE.

By Rev. Wm. E. Hubbert, Blacksburg, Va.

The early history of the Lutheran Church in the South has been chronicled, and it is not our purpose to rehearse the facts on record, except in so far as they subserve the needs of this article. Its history antedates the Revolutionary War, e. g., The Dutch Colony of Lutherans on James Island, S. C., in 1671 or 1674, which, however did not long preserve its identity; the Salzburgers at Ebenezer, Ga., in 1734, (Strobel's History); the German and Swiss Colonists of Orangeburg, S. C., 1735, (Bernheim's History). Though in 1738 there were only two Lutheran Ministers in the South, viz., those at Ebenezer, Ga., the few others who had been there previously having died or gone to other fields of labor, and the difficulty in obtaining ordination deterred or prevented any from entering the ministry who had not done so before coming to this country. In some cases the necessary authority was obtained from other denominations. Rev. John Geissendanner, was ordained by the Presbyterians and afterwards also by the Episcopalians, when he took his congregation into the Church of England, probably in view of the fact of that being the State Church. The congregations being so isolated from one another found it difficult to maintain their existence. In North Carolina, so strong was their attachment to the Lutheran faith, that they sent a delegation to Europe to apply to the consistory of Hanover, Germany, "for a supply of ministers

of the gospel and school teachers." Although small in numbers, the Lutheran Church was not without influence, and it contributed with patriotic zeal in men and money to the success of the Colonial War. The act of Rev. Peter Muhlenberg, when he called his congregation to arms, after he had deliverd the message of the Prince of Peace, is of national celebrity.

Since then, though chiefly agricultural, the Lutherans of the South have borne a prominent part in public affairs in their respective States. They have been noted for sobriety, industry and the Christian virtues generally. The ministers, even in the Colonial period, were well educated, as Bolzius, Daser, Streitt, Nussmann, described as "a ripe and thorough scholar," Wartman, "a highly educated divine," and Arndt. Dr. Bernheim, in his History, p. 263, says, "The testimony of all the ancient records of the ante-revolutionary period, concerning the character of the early Lutheran ministry in the Carolinas," and also of the Southern States, "is so excellent and so impartially written, even by those who were in no way connected with the Lutheran Church, that it is refreshing to read them; God be praised, that so excellent a beginning was made and the best and most competent men were sent by the parent Church in Europe." The same is true after the war, when similarly educated men were sent to this field, as Storch and Flohr. After these men died, or ceased to take an active part in the affairs of the Church, a period of dependence ensued, which almost proved fatal to orthodoxy, and even threatened the extinction of the Church—a period which found its counter-part in other portions of the country. Too rigid adherence to a demand for higher education and the formalities of induction into the ministerial office fetterd the Church, so that it never made the progress which it might have done. There was no aggressive spirit in the Church—little or no provision for an independent future—or no preparation for the transition to English.

There had been no uncertain sound in doctrine. Here we quote again from Bernheim's History, p. 264, "The Lutheran ministers of that period were firm believers in the doctrines

of their Church, and unconditional adherents to the manner in which these doctrines were set forth in the Symbolical Books." This declaration is supported by ample testimony. Even the need of a liturgy was felt, although the country was, one would suppose, illy adapted to its use at that early day, and some of the churches adopted a form for their own service. Instrumental music was deemed necessary, and organs were introduced at an early period. An old and peculiarly constructed organ of that time is even now to be seen in Organ Church, Rowan County, N. C., (whence its name,) where, it is preserved as an interesting relic, and a modern one has supplanted it in the service. "Ministerial gowns" also were used, and the Corpus Evangelicum, the first attempt at a Synod by Lutherans in America, provided for, and made it obligatory upon the officiating minister to appear in his "ministerial dress," both in "public and private" in the discharge of the duties of the sacred office. Parochial schools were maintained, and teachers were sent for from the Fatherland.

But without local or accessible advantages for an education, every interest of the Church had to suffer. Literary institutions stimulate the Church and foster a spirit of theological training; and without such means it is not surprising that there was decadence. They were forced thus to rely generally on such imperfect training as the pastors could give in the midst of their labors, which generally extended over a parish bearing in extent some relation to that claimed by Wesley. This imperfect training led to a want of appreciation on the part of the people, and, to a greater or less extent, a consequent secularization of the ministry. This downward course once begun, it was with difficulty arrested. Ministers who were not educated were not qualified to improve their people, and common schools being neglected by Church and State, education was left to the people, and they depended on "subscription schools," which had little influence on the poor or the indifferent. There was no synodical organization south of the Potomac prior to 1803, if we except the Corpus Evangelicum, a union of Lutherans

and German Reformed, which was of short duration. The Synods became subservient to the necessities of the case, and, while endeavoring to promote education, lowered the standard of qualification for ordination, and therefore adopted the plan of "licensing," which became so general in the English Synods, and which was intended to be a sort of preparation for the ministertial office.

Thus the anomaly was presented of clothing the candidate with the full power of the office during his preparation—a stepping stone on a level with the floor to be reached. Though some have abolished it, most of the Synods still retain it. In some cases, men with families dependent on them, availed themselves of this facility for entering the ministry, to answer a call the nature of which was too often entirely misunderstood. While many godly, pious, and useful men were thus added to the clerical ranks, there were others who greatly retarded, rather than advanced the cause of Christ. The desire to add to the numbers rather than regard for the efficiency of the ministry became a source of weakness, which is felt to the present day.

Lowering the educational standard led to a want of acquaintance with the theology of the Church, for there were few books of approved character accessible in the English language, and thus the spectacle was presented of the libraries of Lutheran ministers made up of the books of other denominations, a non-de-script library, a sort of Joseph's coat!

With the lack of adequate knowledge of doctrine came laxity in practice, and the ministry became to some extent in certain quarters chameleon-like—dependent, for its colors, on the surroundings. A characteristic anecdote is told of a certain Lutheran Clergyman, who, in one part of his charge, where the Methodists predominated, invariably kneeled in offering prayer, but in a Presbyterian neighborhood his posture was standing, while in a section where Methodists and Presbyterians were about equally divided, *he leaned across the pulpit!* A visitor to one of the Southern States says, that he found "an almost entire abandonment of all the usuages of the Lutheran Church. The reason is very plain. The Rev.

——, in his desire to avoid 'Symbolism and Formalism,' had drifted into the most objectionable forms of Methodism. Besides this, of the seven Lutheran ministers whom I met, there is only one who was educated in the Lutheran Church, and their education was only limited at that." There were those who made every exertion and sacrifice to obtain an education at a Lutheran institution, and they were repaid by their increased usefulness and success. And there were those who, like Bachman and Hazelius, were in learning the peers of any to be fonnd in any denomination.

We come now to speak of the present—its difficulties and its encouragements. A bird's eye view of the Church at this time presents a more pleasing prospect; the more so perhaps since, with a few exceptions, its progress is not the result of immigration, and is therefore a more reliable indication of the future. As a consequence of the lack of immigration, the Church South, is almost entirely English, which fact accounts for a want of acquaintance with the literature of the Lutheran Church, which was so much complained of. But although German ceased to be spoken at an early date, the Church South is almost exclusively of German origin. The Lutherans of South Carolina, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas came direct from Europe, as far as regards the founding of Churches. Those of Virginia and North Carolina came from Pennsylvania chiefly, though supplied with teachers and preachers from Germany. Those locating in Tennessee, emigrated from Virginia and North Carolina, and those in Mississippi, from South Carolina. In some instances, families still keep up communication with relatives in the States from which their ancestors came, as those in North Carolina with relatives in Pennsylvania, and some in Tennessee with Virginia and North Carolina. Here, as in the North, the Church seemed to be satisfied that it had done its duty, if it cared for those of Lutheran origin. It therefore has never been aggressive, and to this fact is due its slow growth, but still it has been conservative of its own, and early sought out the abodes of those who had emigrated beyond its borders

and provided them, to some extent, with the preached word. To do this, in those days of difficult, and even dangerous, travel, involved no little self-denial. Many of the congregations of the border Southern States and of the North-west, were organized by missionaries of the Southern Church, chiefly from North Carolina. Revs. Paul Henkel, (as early as 1807,) R. J. Miller and others, made extensive tours in the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom, proceeding as far as Ohio and Illinois. At different times subsequently young men just entering the ministry went West from all parts of the South and there became permanent residents, as Revs. Charles Henkel, and Jacob and Daniel Scherer, and later the Stirewalts, Dr. Harkey, Revs. S. Cook, Hyman, Richard, &c. The Southern Lutheran emigrants are found scattered or in small colonies, as in Union County, Ill., from the Ohio to California, and it causes one to feel sad as he hears complaints from some of the congregations of their great losses from this source, a single congregation losing as high as thirty members in a few years. So great is the attachment of some of these to the Church, that, though having a very imperfect knowledge of the German, they have been known to go five miles on Sunday to attend the services of a German Church of the Synod of Missouri.

The first Synod of the West was organized in one of the Southern States, viz., Louisville, Kentucky, October, 1835, and included several congregations in Tennessee. After the original organization gave way to Synods better suited to the geography of the country, these congregations united with those Synods. This Synod had been preceded by a convention of Lutheran ministers at Jeffersontown, Ky., and held its third convention in Bedford County, Tenn., in a Church, of which Rev. Wm. Jenkins was pastor, in 1837, with ten ministers, fourteen churches, and one thousand one hundred and thirty-one communicants. At this time there were congregations in Bedford, Lincoln and Franklin counties, Tenn., organized about 1824, and in Boone, Jefferson, and Nelson counties, Ky. In Union county and in Hillsboro, Illinois, there were regularly organized churches, constituted

chiefly of emigrants from North Carolina. The Missouri Synod also extended its work into the Southern States, as far toward the Potomac as Charlottesville, Alexandria and Richmond, Va., and South to Florida, Mobile, Ala., New Orleans, La., and portions of Texas.

While efforts to plant the Lutheran Church in the Southern States were made as early as in any other portion of our common country,—just as immigration set in early but afterwards ceased,—the progress made was not commensurate with that attained elsewhere, due to various local causes, rather than to betrayal of trust on the part of the watchmen on Zion's walls. We so dislike to read the lachrymose productions of some men in the Church, who are always "hanging their harps on the willows," and bewailing certain fancied or real losses in such melancholy and lugubrious strains, that we have earnestly wished for an end of their seventy years captivity. A diagnosis of their condition might develop dyspepsia, which would afford some excuse for their complaints. We have not discovered any remarkable activity on the part of those who are so ready to charge it to want of activity and consecration, and to ossification, *et similiter*. Dr. B. used to tell of a fellow student who was so impatient of the slow progress the Churches were making, that he enthusiastically cried out, "I am not going to leave this world as I found it." Dr. B. would give the climax to the account by saying, good humoredly." He went West, and settled out there in —— and I have since not heard much about him." Some of these reformers fight the ills they find on something of a Quixotic plan. That the Southern Church has not made greater progress needs rather an apology than harsh criticism, because it has had to labor under difficulties peculiar to itself in most respects. It is as unwise to mourn over a past that is not criminal, as for a fisherman to be ungrateful for the fish he has caught, because there is a larger number still not caught, or inside of another's net.

The difficulties or embarrassments in the work claim our attention. Among these we notice :

1. Cessation of Immigration. We hazard no opinion in saying that the South failed to attract to it any considerable part of European immigration during the present century. With the exception of the German immigration into Texas it had almost entirely ceased years ago. Slavery had its influence in this, and if it was not the sole cause, nevertheless it had much to do in stopping it. And while the want of immigration does not account for Lutheranism not spreading among those not of German descent, it does account for the increase in the Southern Church not having been commensurate with that of the Church North. What little foreign immigration there is, has been confined to the cities and larger towns, and that from the North is not great enough to have any appreciable influence on the growth of the Church. Of the eighty thousand foreigners who landed in the United States last year, less than two thousand, and these German to a limited extent, found their way to the South.

2. Emigration Westward. The laboring classes of the South could not put their labor to advantage in competition with slave labor. Slavery was, in the very nature of the case, prejudicial to free labor, and not favorable to the accumulation of property by the laboring poor man. Among the German population it was very much modified—they held slaves, indeed, but generally in limited numbers. The German character does not take naturally to slavery as an institution. He is too industrious not to work, and so he was generally found engaged in manual labor with his slaves; but in time the Southern German adopted the measures of those about him, and the settlements of Germans, in which there had been no slaves, or very few, at length began to show a larger number, and as the slaves increased, the young men not in independent circumstances moved West. It was no uncommon thing in the majority of congregations to lose so greatly by this emigration as to have no net increase, though there were encouraging accessions to the Church. This constant loss sadly affected the interests of the Church, taking away as it did many of the most active and enterprising young people, the hope of the Church. Perhaps, we

do not present an extreme case when we say that the paternal estate, instead of being divided among the heirs, or descending by the law of primogeniture, was inherited by a single one, the rest having secured what cash they could and emigrated. "Holding their own" seemed to be the aim, and if that was maintained, it was a subject of congratulation. If this material could have been always utilized to the advantage of the Church in the sections of which it came to be a substantial element, it would be less a subject of regret than it now is, when so many have been lost to the Church.

3. The sparseness of the Lutheran population. It exposed congregations to loss by intermarriage outside of the Lutheran Church. Losses to the Church by marriage are offset by gains by the same means, where the Church facilities on both sides are equal—an equality not likely, where Lutheran congregations are few and not contiguous. The distance between churches was also unfavorable to ready communication and mutual assistance between pastors. And when these isolated congregations were small or poor, they had rather a struggle for existence, than the means of progress. A member moving ten miles from the old homestead got beyond the bounds of the congregation, and thus found it inconvenient to attend its meetings, and if taught to believe in the "no-difference" theory, continued membership would not warrant a ride of ten miles or the solicitation of the services of a Lutheran pastor. Where this tendency was not corrected, it led to people consulting chiefly their convenience in Church attendance. It is by no means intended thus to characterize the entire Church South, for there were exceptions, yet it is true of it in general, as the records will bear us out in stating, and as the state of affairs would lead any one to suppose. In many places, there were faithful men, who did their duty as servants of God in teaching as well as baptizing, whether isolated or not.

4. Another obstacle to rapid progress was the general neglect of cities and towns—even the smallest villages were avoided. In most respects this was a suicidal policy, which it would be an insult to the intelligence of the reader to at-

tempt to prove. About as near to a village as congregations usually got in former days was just in sight. Here too were exceptions, and the exceptions are the strong and liberal churches of to-day; they stand as proof of the erroneous policy of the the past—a policy which is rapidly giving way to a better one, with happy results. It is as unwise to build up a Church solely out of the farming population, as it would be to make it dependent on any other single calling.

5. The Southern Church could not depend in general on European immigration, the failure of which to flow Southward we have elsewhere commented on. As compared with the North, this was a drawback to progress. It is a notable fact, that every denomination in America depends to a greater or less extent on this source of increase. The exceptions to want of immigration, are Texas and some of the larger cities, New Orleans, Atlanta, Charleston, Wilmington, Richmond and a few others. In other cities than those in which congregations had been established, the immigrating Lutherans are lost to the Church because not in sufficient numbers to organize. This loss would cease were there Churches on the ground to care for them.

6. Want of unity and effort has prevented such missionary enterprises as involved a large outlay of means. Even in the formation of the Southern General Synod, there was far from a "united South," and individual Synods still confined their efforts mainly to their own territory. Under such circumstances the Church could not be effectually aggressive, and it is well that there has been any progress at all.

So much for the obstacles in the way. They serve rather as an apology for the past, than a discouragement for the future. And where they continue to exist at all, they are not near so formidable as formerly, and consequently there has been no brighter day for our Southern Church than the present.

The grounds for this encouragement may be briefly stated, as follows:

1. Greater unanimity in doctrine. Every phase of doc-

trine found in our Church North of Mason and Dixon's line, is to be found south. The Synodical Conference has Churches in Virginia, Tennessee, Louisiana, Texas and Arkansas. The General Council is represented by the Holston and Texas Synods; the General Synod North has the new Synod of Middle Tennessee, (formerly part of the Southern Illinois,) and sundry congregations in Georgia, Texas, Virginia, Kentucky and West Virginia. The Synod of the West was formed as early as 1835 and extended south into Kentucky and Tennessee, but was in 1846 disbanded on account of doctrinal disagreements and extent of territory.

Notwithstanding the diversity of Synods represented in the South, we feel warranted in asserting a greater unity in doctrine and a better self-consciousness. There is less antagonism between the various organizations and between the clergy themselves. No more notable instance may be cited than the mutual difference shown by the Tennessee Synod and the several Synods which it overlaps. Between this Synod, (which has somehow been considered ultra in doctrine, but is only careful and conservative of it as it was "delivered unto the fathers,") and the North Carolina Synod, there have been repeated efforts at union, and only recently a free Diet was held looking to an organic union. And as between the Tennessee, the North Carolina, and the General Synod, the *Visitor*, the official paper of the latter, asserts that there is very little difference in their doctrinal bases, and professes readiness to change the phraseology to that of the North Carolina Synod "if it will more clearly define the bases." After quoting the bases of the North Carolina Synod and the General Synod, that paper says:

"Now it is contended that the North Carolina Synod and the Tennessee Synod, which we are told holds the the same doctrinal basis as the North Carolina Synod, are more strictly *Lutheran* than the General Synod, because their basis is a little more specifically defined than ours.

We deny the assertion as unfounded. We *adopt* the Augsburg Confession, and those Synods do nothing more. The expression "in all its parts" amounts to nothing. If we

"adopt it" we take it in "all its parts," or else we do not adopt it.

The Symbolic Books, mentioned in the fourth section, are said there to be "a faithful development and defence" of the Augsburg Confession. The General Synod has never denied, or thought of denying this."

Rev. J. A. Seiss, D. D., who visited the South during last Summer, attending the sessions of the General Synod at Newberry, S. C., bears testimony to the growing conservatism of the Church. He writes in the *Lutheran:*

"We were much impressed and gratified with the growing character of the true Lutheran spirit, in doctrine, cultus, self-consciousness, appreciation and zeal, which we witnessed. In all these respects, the tendency is decidedly upwards, and in the right direction. Another twenty years of activity and growth in the same line and tone, will place our Church South, though comparatively small in numbers, full abreast in character, respectability and influence with other churches, which heretofore have been disposed to look down upon us as hardly worth consideration.

"We were likewise pleased to notice, as a hopeful indication, how thoroughly united, and of one mind and heart, these representative and most influential men are. They feel alike the weaknesses and needs, and they seem to be of the same conviction as to the requisite remedies, bending all their energies and using their best endeavors to the same ends."

Interchange of delegates between contiguous Synods is maintained in a spirit of brotherly kindness and sympathy in doctrine. Perhaps not one Synod in the South would tolerate the same unionistic practices so popular some years since, though they are far from falling into the opposite extreme.

2. Better educational facilities. These are being constantly increased. It is not the work of a day, it requires time, toil and patient waiting. The South Carolina Synod was the first to afford opportunity for higher education. In 1829, the matter was discussed at the Synod in Savannah; in 1830 a committee was appointed to provide for opening a Seminary, and in the following year Rev. J. G. Swartz, on election, took charge of it. He having died soon thereafter, in 1833 Revs. Dr. Hazelius and C. B. Thuemmel, and afterwards Rev. Lep-

pard, became instructors. This stimulated interest in education, and Lexington having been selected as the location, a classical Academy was opened along with it in 1834 under Rev. W. Muller. In 1848 steps were taken to elevate it into a College. In 1859, the College and Seminary were moved to Newberry, where the College has remained since, with the exception of a temporary location at Walhalla; the Seminary, after various changes, has been located at Salem, Va., with the Rev. Drs. Repass and Dosh as Professors of Theology. Both are meeting with encouraging success.

A classical school, in Augusta Co., Va., was begun, in 1842, by Revs. C. C. Baughman and D. F. Bittle. This was removed to Salem, Va., and in 1853 became Roanoke College, under the able and eminently successful administration of Rev. D. F. Bittle, D. D., who exerted so great and salutary an influence on the Southern Church for twenty years or more. In 1854, Western North Carolina Academy was incorporated at Mt. Pleasant, Cobarrus Co., N. C. In 1859, it became N. C. College, under the management of Rev. Daniel H. Bittle, D. D. This College has had in connection with it a theological department.

Besides these institutions, there have been established within the last decade, Mosheim Institute, located at Blue Spring, Tenn., in charge of Revs. J. C. Barb and J. G. Schaidt, assisted by a competent corps of instructors, the curriculum being thorough and extended; the German American College, at Rutersville, Tex.; Beth Eden Collegiate Institute, in Winston Co., Miss., under charge of Prof. F. B. Brown; Franklin Academy, N. C., Rev. H. M. Brown, Principal; China Grove Academy, Rev. J. C. Moser, Principal; High School, Conover, N. C., presided over by Rev. R. A. Yoder; Mt. Airy High School, Va., Rev. J. B. Greever, Principal. In addition to these, there are schools for young ladies, viz., Marion Female College, Marion, Va., under care of Revs. J. J. Scherer and J. B. Greiner; Female Seminary, Walhalla, S. C., Rev. J. P. Smeltzer, D. D.; Staunton Female Seminary, Staunton, Va., Rev. J. I. Miller; Trinity Hall,

Wytheville, Va., Rev. A. Philippi; Mt. Pleasant Seminary, N. C., Prof. L. H. Rothrock; Seminary at New Market, Va., under charge of Rev. S. Henkel, D. D. These schools have an aggregate attendance of about 1150 students. The time of the establishment of these several institutions of learning shows that their influence has been only in later years. They augur much for the future growth and development of the Church, and great good may be very confidently expected, under the blessing of God, upon talent consecrated to such ends. The educational work is aided by three newspapers published within these bounds, viz., *The Lutheran Visitor*, *Our Church Paper*, and *Our Sunday School.*

3. Improvement in doctrine and cultus. Not only is greater unity manifested in doctrine, but improvement, in the best sense of the word. The Church is not only better acquainted with Lutheran doctrine and practice, but is fully in sympathy with the Confession. Some Synods have never left the "old paths;" be that as it may with others, they too now ask for them. The foundations of the Lutheran Church in the South were laid deep—founded on the confession, not implied, but actually stated. Wherever our fathers here established the Church, they founded it on the unqualified recognition of the faith confessed in the unaltered Augsburg Confession and the other Symbolical Books.

The Salzburgers, who fled from the cruel oppression and persecution of Count Firmian, Prince Archbishop of Salzburg (1729–1733), would not accept aid from the English King and his people, except on condition that they would be "protected in the free exercise of their religion, as contained in the Augsburg Confession and the other Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lntheran Church."

When Christian Rabenhorst was ordained to the ministry of our Church, as third pastor for Ebenezer, Georgia, he appeared before the High Altar in St. Anna's Church in Augsburg, July 27th, 1752, and the question was put to him: "Wilt thou, by God's help and blessing, in thine office administer all things according to the form of the saving doctrine of our Evangelical Lutheran Church, which is grounded

thereon [the Scriptures] and expressed and interpreted in our Symbolical Confessional Books" (*unsern symbolischen glaubkensbuchern*).*

Bernheim, in his history of the Lutheran Church in the Carolinas, pp. 262–266, bears testimony to the fact, that "the Lutheran ministers of that period were firm believers in the doctrines of the Church and unconditional adherents to the manner in which those doctrines were set forth in the Symbolical Books. The worship in all the Lutheran churches in the Carolinas was at that period liturgical.

The same testimony is borne by Gilbert's History of the Church in the Valley of Virginia.

In the matter of liturgy the Southern Lutheran Church presented the first authorized compendium in English. Its book of worship was far ahead of anything which had previously appeared, although it is so full of errors as to make a new edition a necessity. Among the general testimony to the value of the Book of Worship, we find the following by Rev. Dr. Seiss:

"We were (during his trip South) again convincingly impressed with the great practical worth and educational force of a book of worship in the hands of the people. We will offend no one by saying that the Book of Worship of the General Synod South has many imperfections. It is agreed that it is not what it ought to be. The wonder is, considering all the circumstances of its preparation, that it is as good and thorough as it is. But, with all its imperfections, there is a certain completeness about it which appears in no other like book in our Church in the South. But for it, the Southern churches could not possibly have reached the hopeful condition in which we now find them. And if we could only have one complete *Church book*, founded on the common *concensus* of our earliest liturgies and those of the ancient churches—*one Book* acknowledged and approved by all our general bodies as the Service Book of the Lutheran Church in English—we are fully persuaded that it would do more for our Church in this land than all the legislation and discussions of all the general bodies beside. It would be the best *Diet*, in any sense the word will bear."

---

*Urlsperger Reports, as quoted by Dr. C. P. Krauth.

The educating power of such a book is great, and that power is manifest in the improving condition of the Southern Luthern Church to-day.

4. "It is an ill wind that blows no one any good," so the fact that the population of our Southern Church is agricultural is not an unmitigated evil. The country is the feeder of the cities, and without its strong arm and clear head their fate would soon be sealed. In places where the farmers and land owners are chiefly Lutheran, they are investing in towns. There is therefore reason to look for good results from future missionary operations in the cities and towns, a work already inaugurated successfully in Richmond, Atlanta, Knoxville, &c.

5. The fact that the Southern ministry is less secularized than formerly. The possession of a farm by a pastor was well enough, considered with regard to personal advantages; but as regards the churches served, it was detrimental, inasmuch as it tended to dwarf their liberality, and unfitted them for supporting a pastor who was not so fortunate as to own a farm. There is less of this now than formerly. Where any other occupation is followed, it is more generally the kindred one of teaching.

6. The almost universal use of one language in the Southern Church is an aid to further progress. Here, as elsewhere, the transition from the German to the English language, now happily passed, was fraught with difficulties. The prospect of renewed and increased immigration is thus not without attendant difficulties, yet it is full of promise to the Southern Church.

7. Above all, the improved condition of the Church pervades its whole membership. Dr. Seiss took notice of this also, in his characterization of the Church and of his observation on his Southern tour, and bears the following testimony.

"We were further impressed with the strong tie of sympathy which exists between the laity and congregations and the general operations of the Church. The people are not only following their leaders, but seem to be one with them, sharing

the same feelings, convictions and aims, and in living and active accord with all that is undertaken. They are concerned to keep themselves posted in Church affairs, stand up for the interests of the Church, and seem to feel that what the united wisdom of the general body advises, is to be accepted and sustained. There had not been a going too fast for the people; indeed, in some sections, not fast enough; and hence their interest and sympathy with the legislation and leadership under which they are."

Surely this is a source of great hope for future prosperity in Church work.

8. The growth of liberality in the Church is an evidence that the people are awakening to the prime importance of working. The early missionary labors required little compensation and received less. They were rather the result of individual effort and faith. Then, such men as Paul Henkel, Jacob and Daniel Scherer, P. Rizer, Wm. Jenkins, and R. J. Miller, engaged in extensive missionary tours with little or no expense; now greater preparation for the journey is needed —purse and scrip, in these days, are needful, as well as Scripture.

These considerations give us a favorable prospect for the future of the Church South. Though comparatively small, yet there are Lutheran congregations in every Southern State, and none are threatened with abandonment. An enthusiastic brother says, that he never knew a Lutheran congregation to become extinct when once organized into a Church. Her ministry is generally well educated, and will compare favorably with that of any other; her laity are favored with men of wealth, influence and official position; her educational facilities, both for her sons and daughters, are good and constantly being improved; the accessions to her membership, notwithstanding the large emigration westward, now net a substantial and steady increase, and for piety and faith none dare say aught against her.

ARTICLE VI.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF OUR INDIA MISSION. FROM 1842 TO 1879.

By Rev. A. D. Rowe, A. M. Guntoor, India.

The founding of the India Missions* of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church, is inseparably connected with Rev. C. F. Heyer, or "Father Heyer," as he is familiarly known both here and in America.

After the reinforcement of the mission, in 1852, Rev. Mr. Heyer was requested by the missionaries to prepare a historical sketch of the mission, including the circumstances which led to its founding.

With this request he complied, and we introduce our article by giving this essay complete, as it is recorded in the old "Church Book" of the mission.

FATRER HEYER'S ESSAY.

The 30th of May, 1837, may be considered as the birthday of the Foreign Missionary Society of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America.

Among the preparatory steps and occurrences which called this association into existence, the following may be mentioned:

During the meeting of the seventh General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, held at Baltimore in October, 1833, a standing committee, called the Missionary Committee, had been appointed, consisting of the Rev. J. G. Schmucker, H. Graeber, D. F. Schæffer, and G. Lintner.

---

* We say "Missions," because at present there are two separate and distinct missions—the one under the control of the General Synod, and the other under the control of the General Council, of the Lutheran Church. Before the separation of these two ecclesiastical bodies, the whole field was spoken of as one mission, though the two sections which are now independent of each other are not adjacent, but are about one hundred miles apart.

This Committee handed in an ably written report during the session of the next General Synod, convened at York, Pa., in 1835.

At the same meeting the holding of a Missionary Convention of Lutheran Ministers was recommended, and accordingly took place in October, 1835, at Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Here the Central Missionary Society—designed in the first place to send the Gospel to the destitute portions of the Lutheran Church in the United States, but ultimately also to co-operate in sending the glad tidings of salvation to the perishing heathen—having been organized, the Rev. C. F. Heyer accepted an appointment to labor as agent of this Society in the far West, and continued his operations as Domestic Missionary, until a door was opened to engage in the Foreign Mission enterprise.

Appeals to the German churches in America, sent from China and India by Gutzlaff and Rhenius, for co-operation and support in their labors, were received in 1836, and were liberally responded to. Among other remittances, the Synod of South Carolina sent a donation of five hundred dollars for the purpose of procuring a printing press for the Tinnevelly Mission—then in charge of Rev. Rhenius. This money, however, was eventually transferred to the Telugu Mission in Guntoor, and expended in erecting the first mission house.*

On the 27th of May, 1837, another convention assembled at Hagerstown, Md., for the express purpose of organizing a Foreign Missionary Society. This convention consisted of forty-four delegates, to whom were added other clerical and lay members of the General Synod, then in session at Hagerstown.

It being thought desirable that this Society should embrace all the German churches in the United States, which might be willing to aid in Foreign Missions, the delegates agreed on the 30th of May to organize and adopt the name of "The German Foreign Missionary Society in the United

---

* This building is now known as the "Old Chapel," and is occupied by our Anglo-Vernacular High School.

States of America." At a subsequent meeting, however, in May, 1841, this name was changed to "The Foreign Missionary Society of the Lutheran Church in the United States of America."

One of the first resolutions which this Society adopted, in 1837, was to support Rhenius and his Mission in India. Accordingly, Rev. Dr. Krauth received instructions to correspond with Rhenius and others in order to make the necessary arrangements. In 1839, however, the sad news reached America that Rhenius had been called to rest from his labors, and soon after, the information was received that Messrs. Schaffter and Mutter, who had been associated with Rhenius, had reunited with the (English) Church Missionary Society, and consequently their stations existed no longer as separate or independent missions.

It now devolved upon the Lutheran Society to adopt measures for commencing a Mission under its own exclusive control. In the Spring of 1840, Rev. Dr. Krauth, Corresponding Secretary, wrote to Rev. C. F. Heyer, stating that the Executive Committee intended to appoint him their missionary, and at the same time requested him to state his views about the place where a Mission ought to be commenced, whether in the far West, among the aborigines of America, or in the far East, among the Hindoos. The following is an extract from the answer returned to this inquiry:

"Whithersoever the Lord may direct we ought to follow and commence the work. The East with regard to mission operations appears to be a more promising field than the West. The American Indians consist of unsettled wandering tribes, difficult of access and not easily brought under the influence of the Gospel. Many members of our Church also have peculiar prejudices against the Indians, which would prevent them from heartily supporting the Society, if, instead of commencing among the Hindoos, we should establish a mission in the far West."

After some further correspondence and consultations, it was unanimously decided, that the first of the Society's Agents should be sent to Southern India, and in May, 1840, the Rev. C. F. Heyer was appointed missionary.

The next meeting of the Lutheran Foreign Missionary Society took place in May, 1841, at Baltimore. At this meeting of the Society, it was resolved to form a connection with the American Board of Foreign Missions. In consequence of this action the Agent appointed in 1841 resigned his commission.

The Lutheran Synod of Pennsylvania having maintained its distinct missionary organization and acting with much zeal and liberality, determined to send out a missionary under its own direction. Accordingly, after receiving instructions at a public meeting in St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia, the Rev. C. F. Heyer embarked at Boston, Oct. 14th, 1841, and reached Colombo, Palmacotta, Tanjore, Tranquebar and Madras, during the following Spring. In June and July an exploring tour was undertaken, with the intention of selecting a permanent place of residence.

On the 31st of July, the missionary arrived at Guntoor, where being encouraged by the Collector of the District, H. Stokes, Esq., he determined, after prayerful consideration to commence the work assigned him—of pointing out to the heathen all around the narrow way which leadeth unto life.

During the meeting of the General Society, in May, 1843, the proposed union with the American Board of Foreign Missions was reconsidered, and the resolution formed that the Society's operations should be carried on as an independent organization. During this meeting, also, the Rev. W. Gunn was appointed missionary to labor among the Telugu people, in connection with his predecessor at Guntoor, provided arrangements to this effect could be made with the Missionary Society of the Pennsylvania Synod.

Rev. Mr. Gunn and his wife arrived in Guntoor on the 18th of June, 1844, and were heartily welcomed as fellow laborers, in the arduous but blessed work of preaching the Gospel to the heathen.

During 1846 and 1847, the management of the mission devolved on Rev. Mr. Gunn—Rev. Mr. Heyer having returned to America. On the 4th of Dec., 1847, however, he embarked

a second time for India, and landed in Madras on the 16th of March, 1848. On his arrival in Guntoor, he found his colleague, Rev. Mr. Gunn, in a feeble state of health.

In the Spring of 1849, it was thought advisable to commence a station in the Palnad District—which was the more readily accomplished by receiving the liberal donation of a house and lot at Gurjal, kindly transferred to the Society by H. Stokes, Esq.

During 1850, Rev. G. Martz, having arrived from America, resided in Guntoor and assisted Mr. Gunn in the Mission, but the following year he returned to America.

After a lingering illness of many months, Rev. Mr. Gunn was called from his mission work below to glory above. He died on the 5th of July, 1851, leaving a widow and two children to mourn his early departure.

The North German Missionary Society having commenced a station in Rajamundry, during 1845, transferred their property at that place to the American Lutheran Society in 1851, and two of their missionaries, Rev. Mr. Grönning and Rev. Mr. Heise united with the brethren from America.

In 1852, the Mission was reinforced by the arrival of Rev. Mr. Cutter and Rev. Mr. Snyder, and their wives, from America. C. F. Heyer.

This sketch brings the history of the Mission down to 1853.

On the 3d of September, 1854, the Mission was called upon to mourn the loss of Mrs. Snyder. She is spoken of as a gentle, amiable lady, and is to this day affectionately remembered by our native Christians.

During 1855–56 both Mr. Cutter and Mr. Snyder were obliged to return to America. The former on account of the health of his wife, and the latter to recruit his own health.

In 1857, Mr. Heyer, being then sixty-five years of age, and having served the Mission more than fourteen years, returned to America. The management of the whole mission, consisting of the three principal stations—Guntoor, Palnad, and Rajamundry—now devolved upon the Rev. Mr. Grönning.

During the latter part of 1857, Rev. Mr. Heise and wife

returned to the Mission, and in the early part of 1858 the Mission was further reinforced by the return of Rev. Mr. Snyder and wife (he having meanwhile married Miss Orner of Reading, Pa.,) and the arrival of Rev. Mr. Unangst and Rev. Mr. Long, with their wives.

Mr. Grönning, who had labored in India for about thirteen years, now returned to Europe for a short period of rest.

Early in 1859, Mr. Snyder, after a lengthy tour through the Palnad, was suddenly seized and carried away by cholera, leaving his young widow and his daughter Lottie to mourn the sad event. They returned to America the latter part of the year.

In 1861, Mr. Grönning returned to the Mission and took the principal charge of the Telugu department of the Guntoor and Palnad fields, while Mr. Unangst had charge of the Guntoor Mission School and assisted in the other work.

The same year a new station was opened at Samulcotta, and Mr. Long was put in charge of it.

The following year, Mr. Heise, who had been in charge of the Rajamundry station, was obliged to return to Europe on account of ill health. Mr. Grönning, therefore, removed to this station, leaving Guntoor solely in charge of Mr. Unangst.

In 1865, Mr. Grönning returned to Europe, whereupon Mr. Long removed to Rajamundry, where he died the following year—he and two of his children being carried away by small pox all within a few days—leaving Mrs. Long, with two children, to mourn the sad bereavement.

Mr. Unangst was now left in charge of the whole mission consisting of four principal stations—Guntoor, Palnad, Rajamundry and Samulcotta.

The field being entirely too long for supervision by one missionary, Mr. Unangst, after consultation with English resident gentlemen and missionaries of the Church Missionary Society, proposed to the Executive Committee in America the transfer of Rajamundry and Samulcotta to the Church Missionary Society. Before this communication reached America, the Executive Committee had also had the subject under consideration, and felt that they were not justifiable in

holding on to a vacant station for which they had no Missionary, and which they had been assured was suffering seriously for the want of a resident Missionary. They therefore wrote through the Secretary, Rev. A. C. Wedekind, D. D., requesting the Missionary in charge to propose some feasible plan by which that station might be handed over to some other Evangelical Missionary Society. The Executive Committee and the Missionary in charge were thus of one mind on the subject of the transfer, before their respective communications were received. As soon as the proposition for the transfer was received, a resolution was adopted and forwarded to India, authorizing the transfer to be made according to the terms proposed. Immediately after this resolution was communicated to the Church Missionary Society at Madras, they authorized Rev. Mr. Alexander to assume charge and pay the agents of the Rajamundry field from and after May 1st, 1869. The transfer was thus virtually made. But the Foreign Missionary Board of the General Synod, being informed by the Pennsylvania Synod and others, that the Rajamundry Mission had been transferred to the American Lutheran Missionary Society by the North German Lutheran Missionary Society, with the understanding that it should remain in the Lutheran Church, reconsidered and rescinded their resolution, and immediately communicated their action to the Secretary of the Church Missionary Society in London, who accordingly wrote to the Corresponding Committee at Madras, to arrest the proposed transfer. The Board being satisfied that the Church Missionary Society assented to their action, transferred the care of the Rajamundry and Samulcotta stations to the Pennsylvania Synod, who at once appointed the Rev. C. F. Heyer to take charge of these stations, according to his own wish and suggestion. This venerable Missionary, the founder of the Guntoor and Palnad stations, once more returned to India, arriving Dec. 1st, 1869. In 1870, he was joined by Mr. Becker, who bade fair to become a successful missionary, but his career of usefulness was suddenly cut off by death, in a few months after his arrival. Rev. Mr. Schmidt and Rev. Mr. Paulson soon

after joined the mission, and "Father Heyer," then almost eighty years of age, returned finally to America.

The Guntoor and Palnad stations were now left to the General Synod of the American Lutheran Church, while the support of the other two stations was assumed by the General Council.

In 1871, Rev. Mr. Unangst, after thirteen years continuous service in the mission, was obliged to take his family to America. This was necessary, both on account of his wife's health, and on account of the age which his older children had attained. During his absence in America, the affairs of the mission were entrusted chiefly to Mr. R. E. Cully, (an East Indian by birth), who had been connected with the mission since 1861, as a superintendent and Evangelist.

When Mr. Unangst returned to India, in 1872, he was accompanied by Rev. Mr. Harpster. Soon after their arrival, by consent of our Foreign Mission Board in America, they ordained Mr. Cully and gave him charge of the Palnad. Mr. Cully had, however, gradually become so much involved in financial difficulties in the Palnad, that it was neither pleasant nor profitable for him to continue his work there. He accordingly resigned his post and left the mission in 1874.

As soon as Mr. Harpster had acquired some Telugu, he took charge of the Palnad—first in connection with Mr. Cully, and afterwards alone, and continued to labor there until he was obliged to leave India on account of ill health, in 1876.

Meanwhile reinforcements had been made to the Mission, in 1873, by the arrival of Rev. Mr. and Mrs. Uhl, and in 1874, by the arrival of the writer and his wife.

After the departure to America of Mr. Harpster, the Palnad field was divided into two sections, known as the Veldurti or Western Division, and the Dachepalli or Eastern Division. These were put in charge of our two newly ordained native Pastors, Rev. B. John and Rev. M. Nathaniel. Soon after the arrival of Mr. Uhl, it was decided to open an Anglo-Vernacular High School in Guntoor, in which he was to be the principal. This school has been very successful, and

is now doing a good work, both in preparing helpers for our mission work from among our native Christians, and in spreading the truth among the non-Christian, high caste boys, who attend it.

As soon as the writer had acquired sufficient Telugu to go to work among the villages, the Guntoor field was divided into two sections, known as the Northern Division, and the Southern Division. The former was retained by the senior missionary, Rev. Dr. Unangst, and the writer took charge of the Southern Division.

During the Christmas holidays of 1876, our commodious mission Church in Guntoor, known as "Stork's Chapel," was dedicated to the service of the Triune God. At the same time, took place the ordination of our two native Pastors. Two events of so important and extraordinary a nature coming so near together, made the Christmas holidays of 1876 a special occasion of joy and thanksgiving—a red-letter week, long to be remembered by our native Christians and all others who had the privilege of being present.

Our native Pastors, Rev B. John and Rev. M. Nathaniel, are among the most encouraging first-fruits of our mission. They have both been wholly educated in the Mission and have its interest at heart; they are able, faithful laborers, and have acquired the confidence of our native Church, and the respect of even the high-caste heathen.

Next in rank to these pastors, come our Evangelists and Catechists and after these, the Village preachers and Christian School Teachers. To give an account of the labors of these various native helpers would be interesting, but it does not come within the scope of this sketch.

The following tables, prepared by careful reference to the archives of the mission will, we trust, be interesting to our readers and useful for reference:

TABLE No. 1, Showing the time of service of Missionaries.

Rev. C. F. Heyer—arrived in	1842	Returned (finally) in	1870
Rev. Walter Gunn " "	1844	Died "	1851
Mrs. Gunn " "	1844	Returned "	1851
Rev. G. Martz " "	1850	Returned (finally) "	1851
Rev. C. W. Grönning—joined in	1851	" " "	1865
Mrs. Grönning " "	1851	" " "	1865
Rev. W. E. Snyder—arrived in	1852	Died in	1859
Mrs. Snyder " "	1852	" "	1854
Rev. W. I. Cutter " "	1852	Returned in	1855
Mrs. Cutter " "	1852	" "	1855
Rev. A. Long " "	1858	Died in	1866
Mrs. Long " "	1858	Returned in	1866
Rev. E. Unangst, D. D., arrived in	1858	———	———
Mrs. Unangst—arrived in	1858	Returned in	1871
Rev. J. H. Harpster—arrived in	1872	Returned in	1876
Rev. L. L. Uhl " "	1873	———	———
Mrs. Uhl " "	1873	———	———
Rev. A. D. Rowe " "	1874	———	———
Mrs. A. D. Rowe " "	1874	———	———

TABLE No. 2, Showing the Statistics of the Guntoor and Palnad Fields.

	1853.	1858.	1870.	1875.	1879.
Ordained Foreign Missionaries	3	2	1	4	3
Ordained Native Pastors					2
Unordained Native Preachers and Catechists	2	2	28	33	37
Bible Colporteurs			2	2	2
Anglo-Vernacular High Schools		1	closed.	1	1
Boarding or Training Schools	2	2	closed.	3	3
Christian Elementary Schools	12	11	30	16	25
Caste Girls' School				3	3
Pupils in A. V. High Schools		50		98	67
Pupils in Training Schools	21	11		51	40
Pupils in Christian El. Schools	89	106	443	195	360
Pupils in Caste Girls' Schools				77	120
Total of Baptisms since the beginning	149	223	543	3185	5303
Membership	140	209	452	2835	4712
Villages in which Christians live	6	7	49	105	135
Approximate yearly expenses of the Mission	$3,300	$2,000	$4,000	$10,000	$10,000

NOTE.—Rev. Mr. Schmidt gives the statistics of the Rajamundry field at the close of 1878, as follows: Ordained native pastors 2; Unordained native preachers 12; Rible colporteurs 2; Total number of Christians 500.

TABLE No. 3, Showing the Number of Baptisms, from year to year, in the Guntoor and Palnad Fields.

Years	Baptisms in the Guntoor Field.	Baptisms in the the Palnad Field.	Total for each year.....	Total from the beginning of the Mission.	By whom Baptized.
1842	.....	.....	.....	.....	
1842	... 3	... ..	... 3	... 3	Rev. C. F. Heyer.
1844	...11	.....	...11	...14	" " "
1845	...14	.....	...14	...28	Revs. Heyer and Gunn.
1846	... 2	.....	... 2	...30	Rev. Gunn.
1847	... 3	.....	... 3	...33	" "
1848	... 6	.....	... 6	...39	Revs. Heyer and Gunn.
1849	... 5	.....	... 5	...44	" " " "
1850	... 7	...13	...20	...64	" " Gunn and Martz.
1851	... 5	.....	... 5	...69	" " and Grönning.
1852	...22	...37	...59	128	" " " "
1853	...21	.....	...21	149	" "
1854	... 7	.....	... 7	156	Rev. Snyder.
1855	...12	.....	...12	168	Revs. Grönning and Cutter.
1856	...17	.....	...17	185	" "
1857	...11	.....	...11	196	" "
1858	...27	.....	...27	223	Revs. Snyder and Unangst.
1859	...32	...56	...88	311	" " " "
1860	...11	... 8	...19	330	" " " "
1861	...19	... 8	...27	357	Revs. Grönning and Unangst.
1862	... 7	...49	...56	413	" " " "
1863	...19	.....	...19	432	Rev. Unangst.
1864	...33	...16	...49	481	" "
1865	...16	.....	...16	497	" "
1866	...20	...51	...71	568	" "
1867	...49	... 8	...57	625	" "
1868	...50	...22	...72	697	" "
1869	...48	113	161	858	" "
1870	...77	608	685	1543	" "
1871	...26	.....	...26	1569	" "
1872	...93	244	337	1906	Revs. Unangst and Harpster.
1873	152	585	737	2643	Revs. Unangst, Harpster, and Cully.
1874	110	...93	203	2846	Revs. Unangst, Harpster, and Cully.
1875	132	207	339	3185	Revs. Unangst, Harpster, Cully, and B. John.
1876	189	219	408	3593	Revs. Unangst, Harpster, Rowe, B. John, and M. Nathaniel.
1877	216	267	483	4076	Revs. Unangst, Rowe, B. John, and M. Nathaniel.
1878	687	540	1227	5303	Revs. Unangst, Rowe, B. John, and M. Nathaniel.

NOTE.—Rev. Mr. Uhl being engaged in the school, his name does not appear in connection with the baptisms.

In the old "Minute Book" of the Mission we find the following, dated Feb. 2, 1853.

"*Resolved*, That this Conference be organized into a Synod, under the name of "The First Evangelical Lutheran Synod of India."

Then after the election of Rev. C. F. Heyer, President, and W. E. Snyder, Secretary, it was further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary be instructed to write to the General Synod, asking to be admitted into connection with that body; also, that in case any member of this Synod should visit America during the sessions of the General Synod, he be considered a delegate from this body."

We have fallen from these dignified heights, and are content to call ourselves again a "Conference."

The name of "Synod" was probably too much for Bro. Unangst to carry during all the years, when he had to do the resolving and executing alone.

While we are not particularly ambitious of being styled a Synod again, yet we respectfully submit to the brethren and fathers who will soon assemble in General Synod, whether the India Mission, with her four thousand members, ought not to find a place somewhere in the general statistical tables of our Church?

NOTEWORTHY FACTS.

Much credit is due to the founders of our mission for the excellent manner in which they have laid the foundation.

Through their prudence our mission has escaped many internal difficulties, which have harrassed and still continue to harass some other India missions.

Among such stumbling blocks is the "Caste Question." Some missions, in their zeal to receive converts, have allowed them to retain and bring with them into the Church their caste notions and restrictions. It was hoped that under the influence of gospel teaching these would gradually melt away. This has proved to be a mistaken policy. Pride, strife, and confusion, within the Church, are its bitter fruits. *Keep out*, and not *put out*, has proved to be the only good and

safe rule. From the first, in connection with most evangelical missions, ours has followed the *keep out* principle. While we cannot say that the hydra-headed monster has been so thoroughly killed among our Christians, as never to show signs of life again, yet we have the consolation to know that the mission has never either publicly or privately encouraged the evil. This is an important matter, and some missions have suffered grievously by taking a wrong step in this direction. In the "Minute Book," under date Dec. 27, 1858, we find the following:

"Inasmuch as a number of the Leipsic missionaries, in the Tamil country, have made application to unite with our mission, in consequence of the position in reference to Caste, held and enforced by the Society which they now represent, and as they are exceedingly anxious to be connected with an *evangelical* mission association, and as our Executive Committee have passed resolutions expressing their willingness to encourage these brethren and have authorized Bro. Heise to correspond with them, in order to ascertain their location, plan of operation, &c., therefore,

Resolved, That we cordially sympathize with them in their convictions respecting caste, and in their intention to join us, and hope that we may soon have the pleasure of welcoming them to our mission."

For some reason or other, this union was never completed, but this action shows how very important the "Caste question" is considered, and also the evangelical stand which our mission has taken from the first.

Our standard of baptism, too, has been among the highest required in India Missions. While our missionaries did not put upon their applicants for baptism, burdens grievous to be borne, they yet require of them such evidences of sincerity as would keep the Church distinct from the heathen world around it. Though the missionary may not be able to see the heart of the applicant for baptism, he is at all times justifiable in requiring works meet for repentance. Some missions have been very lax in this respect. Hundreds have been baptized who had not been subjected to any prepar-

ation and whose motives were not sufficiently scrutinized. The result in such cases is a very low standard of religious and moral life within the Church, which in turn brings reproach upon the Christian name from without.

The external qualifications required for baptism in our mission are briefly indicated as follows:

1. An upright moral life. 2. Regular attendance at public worship. 3. Committing to memory the Lord's Prayer, Ten Commandments, the appointed monthly Scripture verses, and the Telugu "First Catechism." 4. Renouncing Caste, and removing all heathenish marks on their faces and the *uttu* or long tuft of hair on the back of the head. 5. Abstaining from eating the flesh of animals that have died of disease.

We might dwell on a number of other good points of our mission, which reflect great credit upon the prudence and piety of the early missionaries, and upon the wisdom of our Board of Foreign Missions in America. Of such are the fact that none but Christian children are admitted into our Boarding Schools, that no large sums of money have ever been spent upon the secular education of the heathen, that no extravagant buildings have been put up with mission funds, and that the salaries of our native helpers have been kept at such a low figure, that in time the congregations may be able to assume their support.

In conclusion, we wish but to call the attention of our readers to the wonderful progress which our mission has made within the last ten years. So far as we can see, the progress has been a healthy, substantial development, and not a mushroom growth, which may show well to-day and be gone to-morrow. Surely the Lord has done it, and it becomes us as a Church to thank Him for the manner in which He has honored and blessed our feeble efforts in the past, while at the same time, with faith in Him who promised to give the heathen for an inheritance to His Son, we ought to renew and redouble our efforts in the future.

ARTICLE VII.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER AS HELD BY THE EVANGELICAL REFORMED CHURCH.

*Translated from the German of the Rev. Prof. J. J. Herzog, D. D., of Erlangen, by the Rev. G. F. Behringer, Mendon, Ill.

The Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper (*κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*, 1 Cor. 11 : 20; *τράπεζα κυρίου*, 1 Cor. 10 : 21; *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου* Acts 2 : 42) formed and developed itself on the basis of the Holy Scriptures in opposition to the Catholic (Roman) as well as the Lutheran view. Hence it must be viewed and judged from the standpoint of this two-fold opposition, and in doing this, those points, in which it agrees with the Lutheran doctrine, must be well noticed. The Reformed view, considered by itself, just as the Catholic and Lutheran, experienced certain changes until it reached its definitive expression. And even this definitive expression resulted variously in the several branches of the Reformed Church, according as their respective opposition to the development of the Lutheran doctrine was more or less mildly or sharply expressed. This is now to be considered in a summary manner.

The dispute in reference to the Holy Supper, which broke out soon after the beginning of the Reformation, concerned itself at first and chiefly, if not exclusively, about the question: whether the words of the institution are to be interpreted literally or figuratively—in which connection it may be remarked, that it amounts to the same thing whether, with Zwingli, the word "is" means "signifies," or whether, with Œcolampadius, the words "body and blood" are made equivalent to "representation of the body," "representation of the blood." The latter interpretation is no doubt more correct, since in the Aramaic, which our Lord used, the copu-

* Herzog's Real Encylopædia, Vol. I., p. 38–47, (2d Edition).

la is wanting, a fact, moreover, of which Zwingli was by no means ignorant.

At that time, and long thereafter, the figurative explanation was represented to be the *ne plus ultra* of careless, senseless, willfulness, indeed as the product of pure infidelity, as firmly by the Lutheran as ever by the Catholic party. That time has pretty well gone by. For after awhile, the conclusion was reached, that an interpretation which had been defended by such men as Athanasius and Augustine, could not altogether be of evil. In like manner, the impression could not always be resisted, that inasmuch as in the Holy Scriptures an unlimited amount of matter cannot be understood literally, the possibility presented itself of applying the figurative explanation to the passages treating of the Lord's Supper; and that, the connection of the words spoken, or of the institution, as well as the reference to other points of Scripture contents, according to the measure of the "analogy of faith," could decide the meaning—just as Œcolampadius had observed, that "Scripture should be explained by Scripture." For here the fundamental principle must be applied: "the entire Word and nothing but the Word." Hence at the present time, another argument is brought forward against the admissibility of the figurative interpretation, viz.: it cannot properly be assumed that the Lord, in such a highly important matter, and at such a solemn moment, should have made use of figurative language. In reply to this, we remark first of all, that it does not depend upon our idea of fitness or propriety. In certain instances the Lord clothes His thoughts in a form that might not suit some, that might appear almost unbecoming to them, and that really occasioned very sad misunderstandings, (e. g., Matth. 19 : 12). Nevertheless, it does not become us to prescribe to the Lord in what manner He shall express Himself. If it can be proved, that the figurative explanation can be maintained on the basis of the Divine Word, it is thereby furnished with the seal of the highest authority, against which all opposition must cease. But the above quoted argument is used in still another form: it cannot be

assumed that the Lord designed to bestow upon His disciples a mere representation, since the words which He uses lead to this conclusion, that He imparted to them something substantial. Yet the argument cannot be so understood, that what must first be proved is presumed to be conceded. For it is self-evident, that, if the Lord presented His real body to the disciples, it would be virtually emptying the sacrament of its import, to interpret the word body so as to mean the sign or symbol of the body.

Besides, the Lutheran doctrine does not at all bind itself, as Lutheran theologians themselves concede, to the strictly literal sense of the words of institution, which assumes an absolute equalization of the demonstrative subject and the predicate. Indeed Luther, and the theologians adhering to him, saw very well, that the maintenance of the purely literal sense would lead straightway to the Catholic doctrine. And in fact, there is included in the literal interpretation the entire Catholic theory and practice in reference to the Sacrament of the Altar; not only the transformation of the elements, the adoration of the host, the denying of the cup to the laity, but also the atoning sacrifice of the mass,* which, according to the strict verbal sense of the text, must be offered up during the celebration of the Holy Supper. Hence Luther was, for a long time, inclined to the figurative explanation, "because," as he writes, "I well saw that wherewith I could have inflicted upon the papacy the hardest "whack"†—so that Luther's aversion to the trope or figure is really to be wondered at. Hence, it also arises, that Lutheran theologians hear the same reproaches from Catholic theologians which the latter cast at the Reformed.

Therefore, the following alternative presents itself to us: either the pure and strict literal sense, or the pure tropical or figurative meaning; either the Catholic view, exalted to the God in the pyx (deus in pyxide), and to the sacrifice of the

---

* Bellarmin, for his view of the doctrine, rightly appeals to the word κλώμενον (1 Cor. 11 : 24), which will apply only to the bread, and not to the body of Christ that was not broken.

† Luther's "Sendschreiben an die Christen zu Strasburge, 15ten Dezember, 1524"—in De Wette's Ed. of Luther's Works : II, 574.

mass, or the Reformed doctrine, which culminated in the declaration of Beza during the religious disputation at Poissy, in the year 1572, "that the body of Christ which was suspended on the cross is as far removed from the bread on the altar as heaven is from earth"—whereupon the assembled prelates exclaimed: "he has blasphemed." This declaration, in which is contained the absolute abolition of creature-deification has been accepted in the same form by a part of the Reformed dogmatic theologians;* as indeed all Reformed theologians, Calvin and his disciples as well as Zwingli and Œcolampadius, though differing from one another upon various points, substantially agree to the above declaration. Moreover, Augustine, over against the carnally deviating conceptions of the Church in his own days, taught the above view in the words: "Whilst the flesh of Christ was upon the earth, it was not in heaven; now, since it is not upon the earth, it is in heaven." The Lutheran doctrine, on the other hand, with its "in, with, under," presents itself to us as a compromise between two sharply opposing views. Regarded from the standpoint of the Reformed teaching, the Lutheran doctrine bears the stamp of Catholicism not yet fully overcome. This was expressed by Luther, particularly in the heat of the conflict with the Reformed theologians, in several unequivocal laudations of the Catholic dogma, (e. g. in letters to Duke Albrecht of Prussia, in De Wette's Ed. of Luther's Works: IV. 354). Whilst the foremost representatives of the Reformed dogma, in their radical efforts towards the abolition of Catholic errors, went, for a time, too far, and thereby nourished the strife, and in part virtually justified the Lutheran opposition.

With these introductory remarks, we proceed to a more specific consideration of the subject-matter.

The actual institution of the Lord's Supper was preceded by an important event, which, although no mention is therein made, neither could have been made, of the Holy Supper,

---

* Thus Wolleb; vide Heppe's "Dogmatik der Evang. Reformirtin Kirche," p. 470.

nevertheless served as a preparation to the latter, and which throws light upon it. We refer here to the sayings of Jesus in the Synagogue of Capernaum, and to His further explanation (John 6 : 48–63), called forth by the exceptions taken to His remarks on the part of the Jews. We have here the clearest example of a figurative designation of the relation in which the Lord places Himself to His disciples, an example which thereby becomes so significant, in that, with the same, the eating and the drinking of the body and the blood of the Lord is spoken of; and in that, the Lord rejects in the most positive manner that explanation which the Capernaites gave to His words, as if what He had said should have meant the physical eating and drinking of His material body and blood. But what is most important is this: the Lord plainly declares, that neither then nor any other time such an eating and drinking should take place; and least of all would it be possible after His departure to the Father. This is the sense and the import of the words in John 6 : 61–63, in which it amounts to the same thing, whether the words, *ἡ σάρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν* be referred to the flesh of Christ, as the Reformed interpret, or to the carnal understanding, as Luther explains. In harmony with the limitation of these words, the preceding (55 v.) *ἡ γὰρ σάρξ μου ἀληθής ἐστιν βρῶσις καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθής ἐστιν πόσις* must also be understood, *not* of the partaking of the sacramental elements, but of a purely spiritual reception, taking place independent of the sacramental communion. And the disciples, in whose ears and hearts the powerful words of John 6 : 61—63 re-echoed, were in this way prepared and enabled to comprehend the impending institution of the Lord's Supper, and to guard themselves against carnal thoughts.*

Just as everything in the New Testament connects with something in the Old Testament, so likewise the Holy Supper. We are now brought to the consideration of its connection with the Paschal Supper of the Jews, instituted in remembrance of the deliverance of the nation from Egyptian bond-

*Athanasius (To Serapion 4 : 19) says : *σωματικὴ ἔννοια.*

age, and especially in memory of the sparing of the first born of the Israelites. The Lord, in reality, did then and there celebrate with His disciples His farewell supper, and at the same time the Jewish paschal supper—either as the synoptical evangelists report, on the evening of the 14th to the 15th of Nisan, or according to John (who probably has the more correct account), anticipating the paschal feast by one day, on the evening of the 13th to the 14th of Nisan, because He Himself was to be offered as the Paschal Lamb on the afternoon of the 14th of Nisan. This latter view seems to be taken, not only by John (19 : 36), but also by Paul (1 Cor. 5 : 7), both of whom put Jesus and the Paschal Lamb together.* Now it has been maintained that the connection of the Paschal Feast with the Holy Supper, requires that the Lord should have imparted His body and His blood to be partaken of by His disciples. Had this been His intention, it would have been more to the point for Him to have presented the Paschal Lamb to His disciples. But, in order to cut off all carnal thoughts, as well as not to bind the Church to the ordinances of the Old Testament, the Lord presents bread and wine. As a matter of course, we do not regard this to be a proof for the figurative interpretation, but just as little do we regard it to be evidence against the same.

But if the communion is essentially a spiritual one, then this must some how be shown in the reports of the institution of this sacrament; *i. e.*, there must be something in the words of the institution which positively can not be otherwise explained, than by assuming a trope or figure. Here are to be substantially considered the four different reports of the institution of the Lord's Supper, in Matt. 26 : 26–29; Mark 14 : 22–25; Luke 22 : 14–20; and by Paul in 1 Cor. 11 : 23–26. They arrange themselves, according to their contents, into two groups: the one embracing Matthew and Mark, the other Luke and Paul; and though both show an undeniable inner relationship, they yet plainly differ from each other.

* Schmid, "Die Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testament," I., 342.

In view of 1 Cor. 11 : 23, there is reason to think that the report of Paul and the one of Luke can claim the greater authenticity; and just in these very reports we find several points that can in no wise be made to harmonize with the literal interpretation.

The first point is this: Luke writes, *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον;* Paul *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι.* We may now connect *ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου,* or *ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματί* with *ποτήριον,* and accordingly translate: this cup, by virtue of my blood, is the symbol or pledge of the new covenant—which does not impress us favorably; or, following Calvin, we may connect it (*i e.*, *ἐν τῷ,* &c.,) with *καινὴ διαθήκη,* so that the meaning would be: this cup, *i. e.* that which it contains, represents the new covenant which is established through and sealed in my blood. In both cases we have a strong figurative expression. The Lord in the passionate excitement of that hour, heaps figure upon figure. So prominently has that which fills His innermost soul advanced to the foreground of His feelings and His imagination.

Another point which can not be harmonized with the acceptance of the literal sense, *i. e.* with the acceptance of the bodily presence, is the additional clause, peculiar to Luke and Paul: *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰσ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν,* cited by Luke but once in the distribution of the bread. Paul uses it twice, in the distribution of the bread, as well as of the wine, so great is the estimate which Paul places upon these words of the Lord. They are in fact of decisive signification to every unbiased judge. For a memorial celebration pre-supposes a total bodily absence. Whether the Lord really spoke these words or not, they doubtless declare, as has been correctly observed, what must have been understood from the connection of the several parts of the celebration. These words form a well-known parallel to the Paschal Supper, which also took place as a memorial service, (Exodus 12 : 14; 13 : 9). Now then, just as this Paschal Supper is a memorial of a past event, so likewise is the Holy Supper, which the

Lord instituted as a celebration to be observed by His disciples in the future. Yet, on the other hand, it is maintained, from the Lutheran standpoint, that the observance of this memorial celebration of Christ, presupposes a self-participation in the same, which is realized in the impartation of the corporeality of his life. And this same self-participation renders the natural procedure of the eating and drinking to be a marvelous one, whose marvelousness is said to be independent of the condition of the recipient. Besides all this, it is expressly asserted that all this is embraced in the correct understanding of the work: *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.* But the correct interpretation, and at the same time the complement of these words, is given in the conception of the spiritual presence, which, with Christ, expresses infinitely more than with other men or beings.

Whilst we have found the evidence in the report of Paul (incl. that of Luke), that the bodily presence of the Lord is not spoken of in the Holy Communion, the Lutheran theologians have long ago maintained, on the other hand, that this same report contains the strongest evidence against every Zwinglian memorial view (1 Cor. 11 : 27–29), by virtue of the following conclusion; the object against which we may sin must be present; we may sin against the body and the blood of Christ; therefore these must be present. Nevertheless, the major premise is incorrect, and hence also the conclusion drawn therefrom. In fact the presence of the object is not always necessary. Œcolampadius and many Reformed theologians after him have adduced as an analogy, the injury or the dishonor inflicted upon the royal seal or picture of a king, just as one may thus sin against the absent king himself, so we may sin against the body of Christ, in sinning against the holy symbol of His body. From the Lutheran standpoint however, on the contrary, it is maintained, that it follows from the words in the 29th verse, *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα,* that the body is present; for, otherwise, there could be no reference to a discerning or not discerning. Yet it is evident that *διακρίνων* retains its force, even if it have no reference to the bodily presence.

Luther compared the partaking (communing) of the godless, or unworthy, to the ill usage which the Lord received at the hands of the rude soldiery. In this case the profanation of the sacrament appears in its most glaring light. Yet at what a price? At such an one as Luther himself upon closer examination found to be too high. Besides, Luther did not lay so great a stress upon this passage as many after him. The principal passage upon which he rests, is the formula of institution.

In this connection may be added, that *διακρίνειν* may also signify to judge, or to form an opinion of, and in all probability this is its meaning in the above passage. Still this would not affect the main point at issue.

Another passage upon which great stress has been laid from the Lutheran side, viz.: 1 Cor. 10 : 16–22, can not detain us long at this time. The communion of the body and the blood of Christ is compared: 1. To the communion with the Jewish altar, which was realized through the eating of the sacrificial offerings; 2. to the communion with idols, of which one was rendered culpable by partaking of the idolatrous sacrificial feasts in the temples of the idols. In all three cases a communion is indeed established by means of the sensible and the material: by partaking of the bread and of the wine of the Holy Supper, by eating of the sacrificial offerings of the Jews, by partaking of the sacrificial idol-feasts. But the communion itself does not thereby become a bodily one, for it can refer only to a spiritual contact with the altar, when the Jew confesses that he finds himself in theocratic union with the same. Concerning the idolatrous sacrificial feasts, participation in these is intimately connected with a state of mind which has no scruples against taking part even in the worship of demons. In agreement with this fact, the conception of the communion of the body and the blood of Christ must be apprehended. The believer stands in communion with the body and the blood of the Lord, in so far as he is conscious that Christ, through His death, has wrought out for him deliverance from sin and guilt, and that the pledge thereof is given in the Holy Supper.

We are now in a position to take a comprehensive view of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. "As the Lord had loved His own that were in the world, He loved them unto the end." These words, with which the Apostle John introduces his report of the washing of the disciples' feet, find their application, likewise in the Holy Supper. In the washing of the feet the serving love of the Lord is glorified; in the Holy Communion it is His self-denying, self-sacrificing love. Love is the secret of the Lord's Supper, as it is in fact of the entire revelation in Christ. The Lord is in the act of entering upon His sufferings, of surrendering Himself into the hands of sinners—He who is conscious of the fact that all things have been given unto Him of His Father. Yet, in truth, He surrenders Himself into the hands of His own; for them He dies; His death avails for them as unto life. In that He yields His life for them, He becomes theirs, and they become His completely. Thus through His love to His own, He overcomes in advance the impending suffering and death, and gives to the latter its true signification.

Of this the Holy Communion is both the pledge and the confirmation. To this end the Lord has established it as the permanent institution within the circle of His own disciples. In this there occurs, even in its form, a condescension of the divine love unto our human nature, composed of body and spirit,—to which fact the church fathers, after them the scholastic theologians of the middle ages, and also the Reformed theologians, as well as the Reformed Confessions of Faith, have called attention. The symbolism of the Holy Supper, like everything else that proceeds from the Lord, is simple and yet of profound depth of meaning, and therefore adapted, with all its simplicity, to make a quickening impression. On other occasions the Lord pictures the participating activity in the kingdom of God under the simile of a Supper, to which many have been invited. Here, in truth, is a Supper, and moreover such an one in which the Host presents Himself as meat and drink to the guests. Therewith is implied the participating activity in the kingdom of God on earth, in its highest realization—through communion with Christ.

Baptism,—which falls under the same category of a symbolical act, and which, like the Holy Communion, guarantees unto us spiritual realities under the form of material elements—symbolizes the Divine favor needed for the reception into the covenant of grace; the Lord's Supper, the grace needed for remaining and progressing in this covenant, as Calvin teaches: "After God has received us into His family by Holy Baptism, He provides our nourishment for the whole course of our life, and assures us in the Holy Supper, by a given pledge, of His benevolence (Institutio 4, 17. 1). For nothing is presented to us in the Lord's Supper, which is not likewise offered to us outside of the same through the Divine Word, viz.: confirmation of our communion with Christ, out of which there result as fruits, strengthening of our faith, forgiveness of sins, power unto sanctification. But in the Holy Communion, as the Word made visible (*verbum visibile:* according to the term invented by Augustine, and accepted by the Reformed theologians), all this is brought near to us in an especially impressive manner, *i. e.* just as we nourish ourselves with Christ's flesh and blood outside of this sacrament, according to John 6 : 48–63, so is this act of communion with Christ, through the eating and drinking of the pledges of His given body and shed blood, brought very near to us in the most affecting manner. Just as we secure strengthening of our faith outside of the Lord's Supper, so does this sacrament serve us the same purpose—an ordinance which exhibits to us, in the most obvious manner, Christ as our Saviour and Redeemer. Just as we may have forgiveness of sins outside of the Holy Supper—for we would hardly dare to approach the table of the Lord without any consciousness whatever of having received pardon of our sins—so do we receive at the table of the Lord this most solemn assurance (*i. e.* pardon of our sins), and the necessary renewal of this assurance, in view of our daily sins. Therefore we can say, in harmony with the institution of Christ: as surely as we eat of this bread and drink of this cup, so surely do we know that Christ, through His sufferings and death, has wrought out for us deliverance from guilt and damnation.

And just as we ought to work out our sanctification outside of the Lord's Supper, and to make progress therein, so does this sacrament afford us the liveliest impulse, and also the power, to accomplish the same, as Zwingli very aptly said: "The Holy Supper was given us that we might be encouraged to overcome the world (ut ad vincendum mundum animaremur)—in faith to Him who for us did overcome the world."

Such are the considerations which underlie the declarations of the Reformed symbols and dogmatic theologians, when they so often repeat, that the emblems used in the Lord's Supper are neither void nor empty; but that, on the other hand, one can say with as little reason, that the signs in themselves, by virtue of the words of institution spoken over them, either contain or impart grace—as indeed a long time elapsed before the terms *continere*, *conferre gratiam*, came into use in the Catholic Church. For the Reformed dogmatic theologians teach that, to say that Christ is present *in the bread*, is something different from saying that He is present in the *Holy Supper*. A most real and true presence of Christ takes place, a union with us that is neither local nor corporeal. With the body and the blood of Christ there subsists a sacramental union of the bread and the wine. This sacramental union, added to the spiritual union with Christ, *this* it is which renders the celebration of the Holy Communion the culminating point of Christian worship, where man and God meet each other—man with his best endeavors to appropriate Jesus more and more unto himself by dying unto sin, and God with His most precious gifts.

In the above statement is included how much depends upon our faith. This is pregnantly expressed in the Reformed proposition: Christ is received by the mouth of faith (ore fidei). Without faith, indeed, the emblems are empty and void; without faith there is no spiritual presence, no true presence, but only a symbolical presence. But this has been often so interpreted, as if, according to the Reformed view, it were faith which made the sacrament. Yet this were the same as if I were accused of desiring to create the sunlight with my own eyes, since I am compelled to confess that the

sunlight would not exist for me had I no eyes. This accords with the Biblical view. When the Lord says to those who desire to be healed of Him: "Be it unto thee according to thy faith;" and, "depart, thy faith hath made thee whole," does Christ thereby deny that He is the Saviour? Does He intend therewith to say, that the recipient of His gracious power has healed himself?

In order that the celebration of the Lord's Supper may have such blessed effects, there is not needed, either directly or indirectly, any secret of nature, any miracle, any physical wonder, any miracle of the divine omnipotence which should be equal to the miracle of the incarnation of the Divine Word, any miracle which should be consummated, if not upon the altar, yet in the mouth of the communicant, (all this is in accordance with Lutheran doctrine); but rather does there take place a super-sensible activity of grace, according to the measure of faith of the recipient of the sacrament. Not as if the Reformed view, in any way, denied the possibility of physical wonders in general, or even called the same into question; not as if the gift of the Lord to work miracles, and His honorable title, "Wonderful," should be refused to Him. But rather that no sufficient reason is at hand for the assumption of a physical wonder. Such a thing is not needed to nourish the resurrection body, as Luther for a long time had taught, until he saw and also acknowledged, that if the soul were healed, the body would likewise be delivered. And indeed it can not be maintained, that the miracle of the bodily presence is needfull to the assurance of the pardon of our sins, which is bestowed upon us by a worthy reception of the Holy Supper. As little can the Reformed concede to Luther, that, inasmuch as they wish to have only the spiritual without the carnal, inasmuch as they tear away the spiritual (as Luther declares), that therefore they lose the spiritual, and that nothing remains to them but mere bread and wine. The statement on which is founded the opinion, that wherever Christ is present spiritually, there He must also, of necessity, be bodily, can be as little maintained and consistently carried out as the foregoing; it so completely contra-

dicts the actual facts in the case, that Luther himself at last virtually surrendered it. Moreover, the Reformed can not be expected, in view of the want of evidence for the bodily presence, to take refuge in the words which Luther spoke at Marburg, viz: *"if the Lord should place wild apples before me, and command me to take and eat, I would not dare ask: wherefore?" Yet we believe, that we not only *might*, but that we *ought* so to ask, since God does nothing superfluously, and since the question at issue is the continued, effective repetition of a great miracle. The position which the Catholic church assumes in relation to this question throws light upon the matter. She fully recognizes the fact, that the bodily presence does not belong to the essential being of this sacraments, since the sacraments are naught but means or instrument of sanctification. Therefore the Eucharist could really and truly be a sacrament, and could have the full effect of a Sacrament, even if it did not contain the body of Christ. The only reason why the Eucharist must contain the body of Christ is this: that it is offered as a true sacrifice to the Father.† For this sacrificial act presupposes an object to be sacrificed. This then is the only tenable ground for the necessity of the bodily presence of the Lord.

The controversy concerning the communion of the unworthy and godless, which for awhile was carried on in a vigorous manner between the Reformed and the Lutheran theologians; arose for the first time in the middle of the eleventh century. After Paschas Radbert, in the middle of the ninth century, had taught that the unworthy communicants do not receive the body and the blood of Christ, Lanfranc advanced the contrary opinion, which alone agreed with the doctrine of the transformation of the elements and which necessarily resulted therefrom. But the relation of the two Protestant confessions to this question presents itself to us in a simpler manner than has often been regarded.

---

*Schmitt: "Das Religionsgesprach zu Marburg, 1840, p. 108. Luther discusses this question at length in his essay: "Dass diese Worte Christi et." Vol. 30, p. 141 et seq. Erlangen Ed.

† Bellarmin, de sacramento Eucharistiæ lib. V, cap. 22, § 3.

The Lutheran doctrine teaches that the unworthy communicants receive the body and the blood of Christ, because the point at issue is the sensible perception of something material for which faith can not be the organ—as Thomasius expresses himself. Nevertheless, in holding this view, difficulties remain to the strictest Lutheran, inasmuch as we are not concerned merely about the sensible perception of something material, but involuntarily the confession is made, that the body and the blood of Christ in the Holy Supper are *spiritually* received, eaten and drank;* the nourishment itself is also called a spiritual, heavenly food. Luther says, real plainly, that Christ's flesh belongs to the passage: "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." And further: "a spiritual flesh it is; it is in God and God is with it; hence it is alive and gives life to all who eat it, to both body and soul."† So far was Luther led, in order to avoid the Reformed reproach of a carnal interpretation. And therein is again evident an approach to the Reformed doctrine.

Hence quite a long time elapsed before the proposition of the oral eating of the ungodly prevailed, which Brenz adopted as his own, at quite a late period. But so far as the Reformed doctrine is concerned, this question can hardly arise. If the point at issue be the presence of the real body of Christ, which was nailed to the cross, and which is to be received by the mouth of the believer, then, according to the Reformed teaching, neither believers nor unbelievers, neither the godfearing nor the godless, receive the same, because of the simple reason that it is not present; because the bread and the wine are mere signs of the absent body and blood of Christ. But when, in the Reformed doctrine, reference is made to the reception of the body and the blood of Christ, with the mouth of faith, this reception, as a matter of course, is confined to the worthy. Calvin admirably compares this to the rain, which falls upon and down from a stone, and

---

* Thus teaches the Formula of Concord: Müeller's Ed. p. 670.

† "Dass diese Worte Christi noch fest stehen:" Erlangen Ed., Vol. 30, pp. 99 and 125.

which cannot penetrate into the stone. Every organ is wanting to the ungodly to receive that which is the very essence of the sacrament. And moreover, the idea can not be established, that Christ is received into the soul of the ungodly and that He therein works the judgment,—as the Formula of Concord teaches. According to the Scriptures, where Christ is, there are life and salvation. The unworthy communicant eats and drinks unto himself condemnation, but he does not receive Christ. Another question has been brought into connection with the above, viz.: whether Judas Iscariot participated in the first communion. This question has received, in a superfluous manner, from the Reformed as well as from the Lutheran side, a dogmatic range and significance. Judas was probably absent, which follows from John 13: 26–30 compared with Matthew 26: 23–25. According to Luke he was present; the presumption, however, is not unfounded, that the latter passage is to be assigned to the beginning of the supper, *i. e.*, previous to the institution of the Holy Communnion. Hence it is altogether probable that Judas did not partake of the same.

The foregoing explanations have been given in agreement with the doctrinal development of the Reformers of the Reformed Church, as well as in harmony with the Reformed confessions of faith. Yet it will be necessary to add somewhat more by way of complement.

By reason of the justifiable opposition against the enormous abuse which the Catholic Church had practiced with the elements, and because of the superstitions clinging to the signs, Zwingli and Œcolampadius were carried away by a view which, in truth, must be regarded as extreme. Yet Zwingli had a perfect right to teach, that the sacraments do not justify, as indeed Melanchthon had taught in his *Loci Communes*, in the edition of 1521 (vide Plitt p. 251): "the sacraments do not justify; faith alone justifies." But Zwingli went too far in the following definition, in which an element of truth can not be ignored, but which, by exaggeration and isolation, developed into an untruth: "therefore the sacraments are signs or ceremonies by which a man shows to

the church, that he is either a candidate or a soldier of Christ; and they render the church more certatn of thy faith than of thyself. For if thy faith has not been otherwise perfected, if it needs a ceremonial sign for its confirmation, it is not faith; for faith is that by which we resolutely, firmly and unchangeably depend upon the mercy of God." Œcolampadius teaches substantially the same thing. But neither of them adhered to this opinion, and no symbol of the Reformed Church adopted such a definition. The teaching of Zwingli and Œcolampadius, as it shaped itself in the course of the controversy, is contained in the last of the articles agreed upon by the Lutheran and Reformed theologians at Marburg: "That the Sacrament of the Altar is a sacrament of the true body and blood of Christ, and that the spiritual reception of this same body and blood is especially needed by every Christian." But since a material body cannot be partaken of spiritually, as Zwingli remarked, and intentionally emphasized, the final outcome of the matter would be what is taught in John 6: 48 (interpreted in Zwingli's sense as in the *Expositio fidei* to Francis I.), that "to eat Christ spiritually is the same as to enjoy, in mind and soul, the mercy and the goodness of God in Christ." By way of complement, the first Helvetic Confession teaches, that this Sacrament is a mystic supper, in which the Lord Himself presents to His disciples His body and His blood, *i. e.* Himself, in order that He may dwell in them and they in Him (by faith).

Calvin's doctrine is in advance of Zwingli's, and approaches the Lutheran view, yet without surrendering the fundamental aspect of the Reformed teaching. Calvin regards this proposition as essential: that a life-giving power inhabits the flesh of Christ, by reason of His union with the Godhead (Institutio 4, 17. 9.) In his comments upon John 6, 51, he teaches, that in the flesh of Christ, because salvation was wrought out in the same, the powers of redemption are forever deposited. Hence Calvin teaches, furthermore, that to the believer there is imparted in the Holy Supper, out of the glorified body of Christ, a life-giving power, through the mediation of the Holy Spirit. This view is expressed in

several Reformed symbols: in the Geneva Catechism, in the French, the Belgic, the first Scottish, and in several other Confessions.* Herein too great stress is laid upon the instrument with which redemption was accomplished, and herein is manifest an infusion of the Catholic view. Yet the correct thought underlies this teaching, viz.: *that Christ can only then be ours, when our faith is directed to His flesh* (nisi cum fides nostra in ejus carnem dirigitur), *that we must hold fast to the man in Christ if we would reach God in Christ*, (Calvin's own words in his commentary to the Gospel of John). It is eternally true, that in the flesh of Christ, which Ignatius has well termed the Gospel ("to the Philadelphians," cap. 5), the power of life resides. We are directed to draw the forces of life from the Word manifest in the flesh, as it exists and embodies itself in the words of the Gospel message, rather than from the humanity of Christ located in the heavens, to which, so long as we live here below, we stand in no closer relation. And so far as the Holy Supper is concerned, we are directed, first of all, to Christ's death and to the redeeming power of the same, which we, as Paul says, are to show till He come. Calvin has well recognized this side of the question, and has so expressed himself in his commentary, as if he desired to say nothing else than what we have above said concerning the mystical communion with the flesh of Christ. The eating of the flesh of Christ, in the sacrament and outside of the sacrament, is finally equivalent to this: that our faith is directed, in the manner above stated, to the flesh of Christ. Several of the Greek Church Fathers have thus taught, especially Basilius the Great (vide S. Steitz: "Die Abendmahlslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung" in "Dorner's Jahrbücher," 1864, et seq.). This is the view which is otherwise expressed in the Heidelberg Catechism and in the second Helvetic Confession. Wherever in the Re-

*In these, as well as in Calvin's Institutes, the thought is expressed that the Holy Communion nourishes the resurrection body, which can be maintained, since this sacrament quickens and strengthens the inner man.

formed symbols the doctrine is taught, that Christ's body is received in the Lord's Supper in a spiritual manner by means of our faith, there the same aspect of the question underlies the view entertained.

The meaning of the Holy Supper for the fellowship of the believers presents itself as a self-evident result from the preceding considerations. If the worthy participation tends to the confirmation of our living communion with Christ, then it must also more firmly unite Christians to one another, which union is founded upon their union with Christ. Having reached this point, we are compelled to confess, that the two doctrinal teachings, the Lutheran and the Reformed present to us not only differences, but also resemblances, much that is essentially common to both: not only the rejection of the transformation of the elements, the adoration of the same, the ceremonies or cultus of the sacrificial mass, but also the apprehension of the sacrament as a veritable nourishment, as a means of grace, appointed to assure us of our salvation, to strengthen our faith, to confirm our communion with Christ. No doubt it is also confession, as every act of worship is; but as confession it occupies a secondary place—with which limitation Calvin corrects the above quoted declarations of Zwingli and Œcolampadius.

As authorities are to be mentioned: Al. Schweizer, "*Die Glaubenslehre der Evang. Reformirten Kirche*," 2 vols., 1844–47. Ebrard, "*Christliche Dogmatik*," 2d Ed., 1862–63, 2 vols. Heppe, "*Die Dogmatik der Evang. Reformirten Kirche*," 1861. Ebrard, "*Das Dogma vom heiligen Abendmahl und seine Geschichte*," 1845–46, 2 vols. Etc.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*The Light,* is it wanting? why? how much? and what shall we do—(Fletcher Prize Essary, 1879); *My Son, Give Me Thy Heart,* Sermons preached before the University of Oxford and Cambridge, by C. J. Vaughan; *Jesus of Nazareth,* who was He, and what is He now, by W. Patton (Carter & Bros.); *Studies in the Model Prayer,* by Dr. G. Boardman; *Practical Theology,* a Manual for Theological Students, translated and adapted to the use of English readers, by J. J. Van Oosterzee; *Voices from Babylon,* or the Records of Daniel the Prophet, by Jos. A. Seiss, D. D.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Heredity,* with Preludes on Current Events, Boston Monday Lectures, by Jos. Cook; *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion,* as illustrated by the religions of India, delivered in the Chapter House, Westminster Abbey, April, May, June, 1878, by F. Max Müller.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*John Lathrop Motley,* a Memoir by Oliver Wendell Holmes; *The Story of the Christians and Moors of Spain,* by Charlette M. Yonge; *Samuel Johnson,* his words and his ways, what he said, what he did, and what men thought and spoke concerning him, by E. T. Mason; *Hume,* by T. H. Huxley; *Short History of German Literature,* by Ja. K. Hosmer; *Memoir* of G. D. Cummins, first Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Chruch, by his wife; *Washington Irving,* by D. J. Hill; *Decisive Events in History*, by T. Archer; *Gœthe and Schiller*, their lives and works, including a Commentary on Gœthe's Faust, by Hjalmer H. Boyesen; *The English Reformation,* how it came about, and why we should uphold it, by Cunningham Geikie; *Life and Times of Stein,* or Germany and Prussia in the Napoleonic Age, 2 vols., by J. R. Seelye; *Life of John Kitto, D. D.,* by John Eadie, D. D.

POETRY.—*Wells of Baca,* or Solace of the Christian Mourner, and other thoughts on bereavement, by J. R. Macduff.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Lectures on Preaching,* delivered before Theol. Dept. of Yale College, by Matthew Simpson, D. D., LL. D.; *Addresses and Sermons in America,* by Dean Stanley.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY: LUTHERAN BOOK STORE, PHILA.

Second Free Lutheran Diet in America. Philadelphia, November 5–7, 1878. The Essays, Debates and Proceedings. pp. 282.

This is the *second* volume of what bids fair to become a regular series in the Lutheran Church. It contains the matter furnished by the Diet held in Philadelphia, November, 1879; embracing the Essays read, the Discussions on the Essays, and the other brief Proceedings. We shall not attempt a minute or extended criticism, but content ourselves with a general notice of the volume, and reference to a very few special points.

The volume in appearance is very like its predecessor, only about one fourth or one fifth less in the number of pages. This is owing to none of the Essays being so long as some in the previous volume, and the discussions not being so fully reported. The matter of the discussions being so meagre is the more remarkable, as in this Second Diet, the speakers were selected and announced beforehand. It may be that many of them were like speakers on political occasions, more for ornament or show than for actual service. These Discussions are no less important than the Essays, and serve to bring out the truth. It is a serious defect that they are lacking, but one that the Secretaries could not help. The Essays cover a wide and interesting range of subjects, and make a volume of value especially to every Lutheran. If these Diets continue, the volumes will become indispensable to every one who desires to be well acquainted with the character of the Lutheran Church. The Essays in this volume, as a whole, are more practical in character—dealing more with practical, living questions—than those of the preceding volume. Yet some of the old questions that have agitated the Church for centuries, were up for further consideration. We mean no disparagement of any one, when we say that such questions were left just about as they were before the Diet. As an illustration, may be mentioned the Essay and Discussion on "*a True and Reasonable Subscription of the Confessions of our Church.*" Those who insist on an absolute or unqualified subscription, instead of dealing in vague generalities, would do better to test the principle by an application of it to the *Eleventh Article of the Augsburg Confession,* in regard to *Confession* and *Private Absolution,* or to what is taught in the *Twenty-eighth Article* concerning *the Lord's Day;* or even to test it on

"*the Descent into Hell,*" of the Apostles' Creed. In what sense is a subscription to these, and the like, "unqualified?" "In their true, native, original, and only sense?" It is about time that there should be some understanding on such a subject, and especially should it be understood that those who are most urgent about an absolute or unqualified subscription, either do not mean what they say, or mean one thing and practice another. It will not do any longer for men to assume all the honesty and candor in subscribing Confessions, because they profess to do so unqualifiedly, when all the world knows that they are at pains to explain away or deny the true meaning and import of articles or doctrines, which fail to express their present views and convictions. We believe it to be true, that those who profess most in this respect, are the very ones who really show the widest difference between their subscription and their real faith. There are some other points that we designed noticing, but must forbear. We commend the volume to our readers, and to all who desire to acquaint themselves with the Lutheran Church of the present day, as well as with her genius and character in the past. If these Diets are to become a fixed institution in our Lutheran Church, we very respectfully suggest, that it would be better to have a smaller number of subjects, and time for a fuller discussion of them by those entertaining a difference of views. If they are to be chiefly Essays, and the Discussions to be very subordinate, the end can be better gained through the press, with much less trouble and expense. If we are to have these Diets, let us have full Discussions.

My Duty to the Church of which I am a Member. By Rev. M. Rhodes, D. D., Pastor of St. Mark's Eng. Evan. Lutheran Church, St. Louis, Mo. pp. 21. 1879. A valuable discourse.

Ten Reasons why I should regularly attend the public Worship of God. (Tract). By Rev. William Hull. pp. 4.

PORTER & COATES, PHILADELPHIA.

The Fireside Encyclopædia of Poetry, Comprising the best Poems of the most famous Writers. English and American. Compiled and Edited By Henry T. Coates. pp. xxxix., 997.

It is not often that we have the opportunity to notice so attractive and rich a volume as this one of over a thousand pages. Here are gathered the richest treasures and choicest gems of poetry that lie scattered through centuries. The compiler and editor tells us how the work was begun nine years ago, to while away the long fall and winter evenings, and, becoming a labor of love, was continued to completion. The aim has been to present an Encyclopædia of the poetry of the English language that will be a welcome companion at every FIRESIDE. If it fails to be such a welcome companion, it can only be for lack of

acquaintance, and those who make such an acquaintance are to be congratulated.

The volume, of course, does not pretend to give all the poetry in the English language, or even the chief part of it, but only such selections as could find a place in a collection of this kind. The great poems of the great masters—some of whose productions alone would equal in bulk this large volume—are necessarily excluded; but the compiler says: "it is believed that none of the most famous minor poems of the English language will be found missing from these pages." It would be worse than idle to attempt any criticism of the poems themselves. They have passed the ordeal and received the stamp of genuine coin. The selection is as complete as the limitations of such a work will permit. Each poem is given entire, and whilst the largest productions are excluded, some of the choicest pieces of the greatest poets find a place. Shakespeare, Milton, Goldsmith, Burns, Scott, Coleridge, Southey, Wordsworth, Byron, Moore, Tennyson, Longfellow, Bryant, Whittier, and many others, are here represented. The volume is to be commended not only for the rich treasures which it furnishes, but for the absence of the worthless and the vile. It has been the aim of the collection, that 'while representing all that is best and brightest in our poetic literature, it should contain nothing that would tend to undermine any one's faith or destroy a single virtuous impulse.' The collection is not only wide in its range, but varied in character. We have poems to suit almost every variety of taste and condition in life, from childhood to old age, from gay to grave—poems sentimental, humorous, patriotic, religious, etc., etc. They are arranged under fifteen distinct heads, beginning with *poems of Home and Childhood.* But these divisions furnish no idea of the almost endless variety included. The work is furnished with all the apparatus necessary for convenience in finding what is wanted. Following a Table of *Contents* are an Index of the Names of the Poems, Alphabetically arranged, and an Index of Authors, while at the close there are Notes Explanatory and Corroborative, and an Index of First Lines.

We congratulate the editor and publishers in their success in the preparation and publication of this charming volume. Unless we are greatly mistaken thousands of households will bless them for their labor. This volume will be consulted and read both for pleasure and profit, a helper of joy in bright hours, and a solace in hours of darkness and sadness. No household can be familiar with it without experiencing its refining, elevating and purifying influence. It may be added that the style in which the volume is published contributes to its attractions.

Voices from Babylon; or, The Records of Daniel the Prophet. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., Pastor of the Church of the Holy Communion. Author of "A Miracle in Stone," "Last Times," "Lectures on the Gospels," etc. pp. 391. 1879.

Dr. Seiss is very industrious in book-making, and it may be regarded as an evidence that he does not lack readers. In this age of "making many books," it is something to be able to find those who appreciate such labors. Not all authors are so fortunate. This new volume has a taking title, and one that may tempt many to examine into its contents. These consist of fourteen lectures on the leading topics in the book of Daniel, a critically-revised translation, list of authors, and an Index. This last part is something which should accompany every volume that deserves a place in a library. The lectures are written in Dr. Seiss' earnest and impressive style, and are upon subjects, many of them, of vital importance. They abound in practical applications of the lessons of this book to our own times, and cannot fail to fasten the attention of readers. We can very well believe, that with Dr. Seiss' impressive delivery these lectures must have been heard with deepest interest, and they can now be read and studied with profit. The Bible is truly a wonderful book, and such expository discourses serve to bring out its inexhaustible treasures. The accompanying critically-revised translation has been prepared with care, and with the use of many of the best aids. It may help to a better understanding of this prophet, although some of the changes in rendering are of doubtful character. We do not like this constant tinkering at our English version. Some of the interpretations of prophecy in these lectures we are bound to say we cannot endorse, and believe they present neither the true meaning of the prophet, nor harmonize with the general teaching of the divine word. We do not accept the interpretation, that in "the succession of earthly administration there is a continuous deterioration from the beginning to the end." Dr. Seiss is a thorough pessimist in politics and religion. Nor do we believe that the Roman Empire is still existing, and that the setting up of the Kingdom of God is a thing of the future. These Millenarian vagaries greatly mar this volume, and give a coloring to its whole complexion. Still, in spite of them, there is a great deal of most valuable truth, presented with earnestness and eloquence, and the volume deserves a place among the popular expositions of the great prophet of Babylon. Daniel and Babylon should be enough to awaken special interest.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

The Englishman's Critical and Expository Bible Cyclopædia. Compiled and Written by the Rev. A. R. Fausset, M. A., Rector of St Cuthbert's York, Joint Author of the Critical and Experimental Commentary. Illustrated by six hundred wood cuts. pp. 753.

This is a very substantial and attractive volume. It presents a vast amount of matter in the most compact form. In a single volume we have as much as is usually contained in several. The page is large and divided into three columns, the print small but very clear and

distinct, the numerous illustrations well arranged, so that the utmost economy in space is secured. The paper, printing, and general make up of the volume are all that can be desired to make the work acceptable.

It is not designed to supplant the excellent critical Cyclopædias and Dictionaries of the Bible already in use, such as Smith, and Kitto's. The author says: "My aim in this work is to put within the reach of all Bible Students, learned and unlearned alike, the fruits of modern criticism and research, and at the same time to set forth briefly and suggestively those doctrinal and experimental truths which the Written Word itself contains. * * Many subjects which most of the Bible Dictionaries omit, and which are of deep interest, are handled; as for instance. Antichrist, The Thousand Years or Millennium, Inspiration, Predestination, Justification, Number, Divination (in its bearing on Spiritualism), etc." * * It will thus be seen that the work covers a wide field and presents to the reader information on a very great number of subjects of interest and importance. In a work of this kind, with so many topics, some subjects will be treated more satisfactorily than others. The author seems to have made use of the most recent and best material, and thus to furnish the student of the Bible with the results of the latest criticisms. A special value is given to some parts of the volume by the use made of the most recent investigations and discoveries in Bible lands. Too many of our Bible Dictionaries have been content to repeat views adopted long ago, without any careful or critical examination in the light of the present day. The production of such a work by a single author is evidence of zeal and energy in the cause of sacred learning. It is rather surprising that, in this age of division of labor, one man would undertake so much and so varied in character; but he has toiled earnestly and well, and this is, he tells us, "the fruit of my labors for the last seven years."

We do not pretend to have examined all or a majority of the articles in this volume; but such examination as we have been able to give it, has impressed us with its substantial merits. It will be found a real help in the study of the Bible, and also in the examination of important doctrinal subjects. Some subjects that we have looked for have not found a place here, whilst a few might perhaps have been omitted. The author's general candor and fairness appear throughout, but he has taken occasion to inject his Millenarian views where the opportunity offers. It is hardly fair in such a work to present the views he does on *The Thousand Years*, and other related subjects, as if they were accepted without challenge. Some may consider this Millenarianism a recommendation, but more will regard it as a defect or blemish. As a whole, the work may be commended as one of real value, presenting within moderate compass and at a reasonable cost, an immense treas-

ure of scriptural and religious truth. The style in which the work is presented is worthy of the matter it contains. It deserves a place in the library of students, and also in every intelligent Christian family.

Philosophy, Historical and Critical. By Andrè Lefèvre. Translated with an Introduction by A. H. Keane, B. A. London, Chapman and Hall; Phila., J. B. Lippincott & Co.

M. Lefévre's book—which forms a volume in "The Library of Contemporary Science"—illustrates the goal to which Materialism logically comes. We have seen no book that more thoroughly asserts the monism of matter and denies all spiritual essence in man or above man. It teaches the blankest atheism, with a most excited zeal. It insists on our quickly getting rid of all idea of the reality of God, the soul, free-will, immortality, conscience, and intrinsic, immutable morality. With M. Lefèvre even such men as J. S. Mill and Voltaire have had too much of the absurd and pernicious superstition of religion, "the persistence of the religious views," left in them.

One is struck, in reading this volume, with the constant evidence of loose thinking, and the incessant contempt of sequence in the necessities of logical connection. Still worse, is the wholesale dishonesty of representation in stating the history of thought. Many of the pictures are about as true to fact as are the experiences of Don Quixotte or the adventures in Jules Verne's novels. The author's account of the teachings of Christianity is but gross, unmitigated carricature. The animus of his writing seems, throughout, to be an intense bitterness against the Christian religion; and from every point of discussion he turns to assail it. His hatred of "metaphysics" is only one degree milder than of religion. His commonest argument is the use of epithets and calling of names. To dispose of any old truth, even a fundamental law of human thought, he thinks it enough contemptuously to call it "anthropomorphism." He writes, in short, as a superficial, bitter partisan; and though vaunting his devotion to "science," is utterly without the true scientific spirit.

The Translator has done a good thing in pre-fixing an introduction to the work, cautioning the reader against its materialism and atheism, and showing briefly some of its untenable assumptions. The extreme positions of the book, refuted by the very absurdity of excesses, but written in sprightly style, make it perhaps one of the best volumes in which to see the dreary wastes into which materialism would lead us. The enterprising publishers have issued the work in very clear type and attractive appearance.

ROBERTS BROTHERS, BOSTON.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Life and Times of Stein; or Germany and Prussia in the Napoleonic

Age. By J. R. Seeley, M. A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. 2 vols. pp. 546 and 568. 1879.

In these two fine octavo volumes we have a work of the first order. It must take its place at once and permanently among the standard volumes in the alcoves of our libraries of history. In its production the two essential conditions of a great work were given—a subject and period with decisive relations to grand national changes and human welfare, and a writer capable of rightly setting them forth. In the life and times of Stein, "whom destiny made the Ararat upon which the ark of Prussia's greatness rested," and the transformation connected with his name, there opened a period full of interest and memorable in the history of Germany and of Europe. The able professor at Cambridge has brought to the delineation of it the thorough knowledge of historical authorities and the crystalline clearness of style needed to portray the period and the great movements that marked it. His discrimination and sound judgment are evident throughout his work.

The author's plan is best given from his Preface: "It is not to set forth the merits of a great man who has been too little known that I write the life of Stein at such an unusual length, but on account of the intrinsic importance of the revolutions in which he took part. It has been my object to consider the transformation of Germany and Prussia in the Napolenic age, which has usually been contemplated by us as a part of the life of Napoleon, in its proper place as a part of German history. When I first asked myself how this subject might best be treated, I remarked that it was one which specially needed to be gathered up in a person. I soon satisfied myself that the only person who could be taken in this way to represent his nation and his time was Stein. * * The public are invited to read this book simply because they will find in it an account, the clearest the writer could produce, of a great and momentous transition in the history of Germany."

The work covers a period extending from 1757 to 1831. It opens with an account of the home and family of Stein, gives his early life, education, and the influences that moulded and prepared him for the part he was destined to act, his entrance into the service of Prussia, and the condition of the country; and then traces with satisfactory minuteness and remarkable clearness his eventful public career, in various relations, through all the struggles, misfortunes, changes and revolutions that fell to the lot of Germany and Europe from Napoleon's wonderful military movements. The most active and successful part of his life was comprised between 1807 and 1815, when the Allied Powers rose against the tyranny of the French conqueror. The history necessarily brings into view almost all the great men whose names stand out most prominently in the records of those revolution-

ary years, and the pen of our author delineates, with life-like clearness, the various characters and parts they sustained. Prof. Seeley's judgment of the part fulfilled by Stein and the extent to which his influence has reached, is best indicated by a brief extract or two: "The anti-Napoleonic revolution commences, in the bosom of which was nursed that nationality doctrine, that doctrine of the unity of Germany, and that new military system, which together were to give the nineteenth century so much of its character. In this great German and European movement Stein and his colleagues have almost as great a share as in the internal reconstruction of Prussia. But they are not able to carry it so far. Stein has retired somewhat into the background, and Scharnhorst is dead, when the overthrow of Napoleon actually takes place, and Germany does not reach its goal of unity till that whole generation has been laid in the grave. Later events have cast a glory upon the ministry of Stein which was by no means observed to shine upon it while it existed." "He might be called the founder of the modern German nation."

It is interesting to notice the thorough integrity of character and life which his pious training and Protestant Christian faith gave him. He regarded the rationalism of his day as hollow and empty, and as paralyzing Christianity by depriving it of its true character as an exceptional revelation, unique and mysterious. The whole work besides being one of the most interesting and attractive historical productions, is full of impressive lessons for the thoughtful reader and student of history. It affords us pleasure to call the attention of the readers of the REVIEW to it.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.
Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.

Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religions of India. Delivered in the Chapter House, Westminster Abbey, in April, May and June, 1878. By F. Max Müller, M. A. pp. xvi., 382. 1879.

That Max Müller has given us another very interesting volume, no one will doubt who has read his previous productions; but that he has added much if anything to the elucidation of the main subject indicated by the title of this volume will be more seriously questioned. There is indeed danger that the volume may do harm to those who read it with credulity, and that they may embrace fiction as fact, or may mistake what the author thinks might seem "like a fairy-tale" for sober truth. Max Müller has attained such a distinction in some department of study, that many will be ready to accept almost anything coming from such a source, and we may expose ourselves to the charge of presumption in arraying his statements or conclusions. Yet it will require only a little candor and a very moderate acquaintance

with the subject, to satisfy any one that he cannot be implicitly followed. It seems to us marvelous, indeed, with what assurance some statements are presented, and have been presented again and again, with confessedly little or nothing to sustain them. We have what purports to be a chronological arrangement of the Vedic literature, running backward from the third century before the Christian era, to a period indefinitely beyond, B. C. 1000; and yet our author admits the folly of any "attempt to measure it by years or centuries, which can never be more than guess-work." How true this admission is, and how untrustworthy are the conclusions or guesses of our author, may be shown by the testimony of another distinguished scholar in the same field. Prof. Whitney, of Yale, reviewing another work of Max Müller, some years ago, says: "It can scarcely be said that there is a single Sanskrit work, not of quite modern authorship, in existence, whatever be its prominence and importance, as to the period of which their reigns not an uncertainty to be measured by centuries. The one reliable date which we possess for Indian history, until times long posterior to the Christian era, is furnished by the Greek accounts of the Indian Sovereign 'Sandrocothes,' contemporary of the early successors of Alexander. * * * This datum is well styled by our author the sheet anchor of Indian Chronology; without it we should be, even respecting the most important eras of Indian history, drifting almost hopelessly at sea." The only "reliable date," then, is less than three hundred years before the Christian era, and yet we have the centuries measured out as if they had been ascertained. We may not, indeed, deny a long time, but the number of centuries in any one or all of the periods named is truly "guess-work," until we have better information. The reader will know how to receive the following statement based on such guesses. "One thing is certain: there is nothing more ancient and primitive, not only in India, but in the whole Aryan world, than the hymns of the Rig-Veda. So far as we are Aryans in language, that is in thought, so far the Rig-Veda is our own most ancient book." Nor this may or may not be so, but our author has furnished little proof to make it "certain," and we are inclined, so far, to give quite as much weight to Gladstone's arguments in favor of the antiquity of "old Homer's" songs, as to the unsupported declarations of our author in favor of the Rig-Veda. We do not pretend or wish to decide such a question, but must be allowed to protest against learned men attempting to put forth mere guesses—vague speculations—as well established truth. Professor Whitney says: "We have been taught, by long and sad experience, that a Hindu date is not a thing that we can clutch and hold." We simply desire to put our readers on their guard on this point. We do not understand the Bible to be included in the statement in regard to the antiquity of the Vedic literature. It may be well, however, to avoid misapprehension,

to bear in mind that this earliest authentic date in this history, is some centuries later than the last of the prophets of the Old Testament; and that we have most trustworthy records in the Hebrew Scriptures antedating this a thousand years. When the author or authors of the Rig-Veda were uttering their unintelligible words of divine homage and worship, David's Psalms to the praise of *the living God* were sung among the Jews.

We should be disposed to join issue with our author on a most vital point—the origin and nature of religion. We accept gladly his testimony to the universality of religion, and its importance as an element in the life of individuals and peoples. These lectures should help to counteract the vulgar skepticism in regard to all religion, and to lead to a more serious examination into its true nature and claims. Surely a fact so universal, and a power so all embracing, are not to be set aside with contemptuous indifference, or pretended superior wisdom. Religion claims and deserves the attention of the philosopher and the peasant, of all ages, ranks, and conditions alike. The Bible truly says: "It is not a vain thing for you; because it is your life." But we cannot accept his definition of religion or his unfolding of its history in the life of the race. He says: "Religion is a mental faculty which, independent of, nay, in spite of sense and reason, enables man to apprehend the infinite under different names and under varying disguises." This explanation of the origin of religion sounds very much like that of Epicurus, of whom Cicero says: "He alone first founded the idea of the existence of the Gods on the impression which nature herself hath made on the minds of all men." His religious ideas seem about as vague as those of Epicurus, and his divinities of about as little concern—even whether true or false. Religion is religion, and worship is worship, and it seems to matter very little at what shrine one pays his devotions, that of "Jehovah, Jove, or Lord." The discussion of this point would lead far beyond an ordinary book-notice. But we do not think the learned author has given a correct or satisfactory account of the nature of religion, its origin in the soul of man, or of its development in history. It may be well enough, for his purpose, to give no special weight to the Scriptural view of man's origin and nature, but any philosophy of religion that ignores the supernatural, or that seeks to explain everything on merely naturalistic principles, must signally fail. We do not know where Max Müller stands religiously, but we fear his religion is of the very broad school, which is only another way of saying that it may be anything or nothing. He seems to make no very wide distinction between Hindu, Buddhist, Mohammedan, Jew, and Christian, save that he accords to the Christian "that which is better than all"—"our love of God, call Him what you like"—and that in some "quiet crypt," where each

worshipper has held what he values most, is contained what "may become the Church of the Future." Now we must be simple minded enough to say, that we do not believe in anything of the sort, and that this volume has only strengthened our conviction of the truth of what was said by one whose authority has not yet been set aside: "The world by wisdom knew not God."

Notwithstanding these and other strictures that might be made, we can assure our readers that they will find this volume a most enjoyable one, affording both pleasure and instruction. It is written with all the freshness which characterize the productions of our author, abounding in interesting facts, apt quotations, and happy illustrations. There is a great deal of very interesting and valuable information, and it only needs proper care to distinguish between the fanciful and real. The question indeed might be raised to which department to assign the volume—that of fiction or truth—and a proper division would assign a good share to each.

Bismarck in the Franco-German War 1870-1871. Authorized Translation from the German of Dr. Moritz Busch. In two volumes. pp. 364, 347.

These volumes, it is well known, have attracted special attention in Europe. There is everything to invest them with interest. Bismark is an acknowledged leader in the affairs of this generation. The Franco-German war changed the political aspect of the old world. The leading spirit in the counsels of nations, and whose opinions and judgment have been as potent as the will of the first Napoleon, must figure in history as a most remarkable character. We are here introduced to his private daily life, during this most eventful period. Dr. Busch has acted the part of another Boswell, and these two volumes are the result. He lets us know how the great Chancellor traveled, where he stopped, what kind of accommodations he had, what he ate and drank, when he retired and when he got up, what was said to him, and what he said, in a word, a minute account of his daily life just when that life was most eventful. No one can read the volumes without receiving the impression that Bismarck possesses great individuality of character—a mind of his own. We are surprised at the freedom of his conversations, and especially at the freedom with which his utterances on almost every variety of subjects, including living persons, are here spread out before the reader. There is the most perfect freedom, a complete abandon, which makes the reading of the volumes a constant surprise and pleasure, as well as a means of interesting and valuable information. It is not often that one is allowed to enjoy such a picture of the private life of so distinguished a public man as Bismarck; and the view here presented, whilst it exhibits him to us as true flesh and blood, must serve to exalt him in our esteem. Nothing is

more noticeable in his character than his large, practical common sense, and his profound religious convictions, his strong religious faith and loyalty to duty. It reveals the secret of what is most remarkable in this truly great man, that on the morning after the surrender of the Emperor Napoleon, in his room when everything bore the marks of the excitement and confusion, conspicuously observable were two volumes—"Daily Watchwords and Texts of the Moravian Brethren for 1870," and "Daily Refreshment for Believing Christians," and which we are told "the Chancellor was accustomed to read at night." He himself ascribes everything he is able to do to his faith in God and His revealed word. He says: "If I were no longer a Christain I would not remain for an hour at my post."

Dr. Busch has given us two volumes of no ordinary interest, and they will no doubt be read with as much curiosity and delight here as in the old world. Bismark's fame is world-wide, and if these volumes are not necessary to spread it, they will serve to gratify the desire so natural to know something more of the man, as well as of the great Chancellor. The only defect we feel disposed to mention, is the lack of any kind of Index to the two volumes—a defect the greater because the table of Contents is so meagre as to serve very little or no purpose. The reader may not feel the want of any Index while he is carried along through the whole of this narrative, but when he wishes to recur again to some particular incident or to consult the work on some fact, he will feel provoked that he has no guide to help him.

Were it not for the inside, this work with its design, including the inscription "*Gott mit Uns, 1870,*" might pass for a German publication. As it is, it will be attractive to both Germans and Americans.

St. Paul at Athens; Spiritual Christianity in relation to some aspects of modern thought. Nine Sermons preached in St. Stephen's Church, Westbourne Park. By Charles Shakspeare, B. A., assistant Curate. With a Preface by Rev. Canon Farrar, D. D. pp. xvi., 167.

To a certain class of readers this volume will be found intensely interesting. It is quite out of the ordinary line of preaching, and could not be commended as a model for the staple of pulpit discourse. Indeed the apology is offered by the author: "That in a Church in which two earnest pastoral discourses were preached every Sunday, it was permissible to employ the third (afternoon) service, at least occasionally, in speaking upon subjects somewhat remote from ordinary congregational needs, yet possibly helpful to special types of mind." Viewed in this light and judged by the avowed aim of the author, these sermons deserve and will command thoughtful attention. They show the contact of the Gospel with Grecian and Roman culture, and carry the subject forward to our own age, dwelling especially upon "spiritual Christianity in relation to some aspects of modern thought.

Whilst greater concessions are made to certain phases of modern thought, than we may think necessary or wise, there is much said to commend the Gospel to the class of hearers had in mind. They evince scholarly research, and the thoughts are presented in a clear and simple style, befitting the character of the subjects treated. The sermons are not, and could not be, profound discussions of the various points brought under review, but are brief and popular exhibitions such as would be adapted to a select audience on Sabbath afternoon. They furnish food for thought, and may not only be read with pleasure, but studied with profit.

Epochs of Ancient History. The Roman Empire of the Second Century or the Age of the Antonines. By W. W. Capes, M. A., Late Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, and Reader in Ancient History in the University of Oxford. With two Maps. pp. xiv., 226. 1879.

We have so often commended this interesting and valuable Series of Histories, that it is almost superfluous to repeat our commendation. This volume is one of more than average interest. It brings before us some of the most illustrious characters of the second century of the Christian era. It exhibits some of the trials and victories of the Christian faith. Illustrious statesmen and philosophers meet face to face with humble confessors and martyrs. The volume will be read with pleasure and profit by all classes.

The Dawn of History; An Introduction to Pre-historic Study. Edited By C. F. Keary, M. A., of the British Museum. pp. viii., 240.

This volume carries us into the region of mists and clouds. The author deems it necessary to remind the reader, at the very beginning, and "once for all—that our knowledge upon all these points is but partial and uncertain, and never of such a character as will allow us to speak with dogmatic assurance." The most that can be claimed is, that the conclusions reached, so far as any are reached, "can only be built upon inferences of a higher or lower degree of probability." It will readily be seen that great caution must be exercised in what is believed on such evidence. The aim of the work is good—to gather what light we can from pre-historic times: and the plan is "to put the reader in possession of (1) the general results up to this time attained, the chief additions which pre-historic science has made to the sum of our knowledge, even if this knowledge can be given only in rough outline; (2) the method or mechanism of the science, the way in which it pieces together its acquisitions, and argues upon the facts it has ascertained; and (3) to put this information in a form which might be attractive and suitable to the general reader." The volume covers quite a wide field of observation and research. To aid those

who may desire to pursue such studies, Notes and and Authorities are added, and the volume is completed with an Index. It is an interesting and valuable contribution to the department of study to which it belongs.

G. P. PUTMAN'S SONS, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. P. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Outlines of Ontological Science; or a Philosophy of Knowledge and of Being. By Henry N. Day, Author of "Art of Discourse," "Psychology," "Logic," "Aesthetics," and "Ethics." pp. 441. 1878.

This new work by Prof. Day well sustains his acknowledged reputation as a clear thinker and an able writer. The indications of scholarly research and sound judgment, in the department of inquiry to which he has given himself, and to which his various works belong, are everywhere evident on the pages of the volume before us. In our country, comparatively little has been done in the way of distinct, formal treatises on Ontology, or the investigation of the first principles and validity of knowledge. We are pleased especially to see, in this work, an effort made to give it scientific form and offer it in this shape to students of psychology, and others seeking solid foundations in the metaphysics of science. The subject is treated under four leading divisions: — *Philosophical Logic, Philosophical Psychology, Philosophical Theology, and Philosophical Cosmology.*

Prof. Day does very valuable service in this work by the clearness and force with which he shows and maintains throughout, that knowledge in its exact definition is *a conscious identification or differencing of subject and attribute;* and especially that the positive form, *identification* is the *primary* one. Knowledge, as it is thus seen to appear, in its true genesis, is something positive—the law of identity taking precedence of that of contradiction. Much confusion has recently come into speculative science from failing to observe this primary place of the affirmative judgment, and making knowledge begin in differentiation, putting the negative before the positive. The result has been that philosophy being made to rest on a purely negative basis, has become partial and without proper authority. The author disposes very effectively of the nondescript *substratum*, or "thing-in-itself," that has often perplexed and confused philosophic thinking. With his account of the nature and function of "the Reason," and of the character of so-called "first truths," many will not be entirely satisfied; but the analysis and explanation he gives are strongly sustained, and make these primary principles carry the full authority of self-evident truths. In philosophical theology, Prof. Day finds thought, in its first principles and essential implications, truly theistic, and maintains that human knowledge reaches legitimately to the being and chief attributes of God. The chapter on cosmical order is admirable, impressing the

reader with the harmony of truth, the harmony of laws of thought in the human mind and of being in the cosmos. The cosmogony presented is theistic, and the intrinsic difficulties and repugnancy to reason of the theory of a mere materialistic evolution are clearly stated. The work is one of high merit. The style is admirably calm and clear—suited to philosophic discussions. The volume deserves to be made a manual for instruction in our higher education, and is worthy of careful reading by all inquirers after truth in the elevated range of investigation to which it belongs.

D. APPLETON & COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The English Reformation; How it came about, and why we should uphold it. By Cunningham Geikie, D. D., author of "The Life and Words of Christ," etc. pp. xv. 512. 1879.

The author of this volume had won an enviable reputation, as a scholar and writer, by his *Life and Words of Christ.* He will need no introduction or commendation. The present work was written with an evident purpose, and it is admirably adapted to its accomplishment. The author sees in Romanism, and in the Romanizing tendencies among High Churchmen, a dangerous enemy to civil and religious liberty, as well as to pure Christianity. He rehearses the story of the English Reformation to show us at what a price we obtained our present freedom and religious blessings. If he has not added much that is new, he has told the story over in such a way as to arouse attention and warm our blood. No one can read this volume, however familiar he may be with all the leading characters and events, without being deeply stirred. The characters and scenes are presented with life like freshness, and we are led to feel ourselves in the very midst of the moving panorama. A few comparatively brief chapters bring us to the eve of the Reformation, and then we are carried forward through the successive steps, until we behold "the Protestant Reformed Faith" established. A "*Preface to the American Edition*" is a note of warning to the Churches of this land against the encroachment of Rome, and the leaven of Ritualism. We may not be very sensible of any danger. The author, however, thinks the danger real, and no one can doubt his learning or his candor. Both as a contribution to the history of the Reformation, and as an earnest plea for our Protestantism, the work deserves and no doubt will receive more than ordinary attention. A false liberality, which is indicative of a lack of interest in the truth, and not of genuine charity, needs such an exhibition as these pages furnish. It should serve to stimulate our zeal, strengthen our faith, and increase our love for the truth, that was reckoned worthy of so much sacrifice, even to the not counting life itself dear, to call to mind those times gone by, and we thank the author for the vivid manner in which he has brought them again before our view.

Studies in the Model Prayer. By George D. Boardman, D. D., Author of "the Creative Week." pp. 201. 1879.

This volume embraces nine lectures or expositions, on what is commonly called "*the Lord's Prayer.*" Our author thinks it better to call it "*The Model Prayer,*" as the common title may mislead: and he thinks "The Lord's Prayer" would be more applicable to the Seventeenth Chapter of St. John. It is too late, we think, to attempt a change in the title. These lectures are marked by great simplicity, in the true and best sense, by an apparent aim to get out the real meaning and spirit of the wonderful words. Not only each petition, but each word seems to be carefully pondered, and the meaning caught and applied. The volume is well adapted to be read in the family, and its careful reading would certainly aid in a better understanding and appreciation of this oft repeated prayer. In an Appendix there is a note on "The Question of the Doxology," and another on "The Question of Liturgy." A favorable judgment is expressed in regard to the moderate and judicious use of forms of worship—or the use of Liturgical service. At the same time, the abuse is earnestly deprecated. The volume is presented in an attractive style, on heavy paper, with leading points and Scripture reference in the margin.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Spiritual Manifestations. By Charles Beecher. pp. 322. 1879.

The author is a son of Dr. Lyman Beecher, and brother of Dr. Edward and Henry Ward Beecher. He has written a number of books—among them "Redeemer and Redeemed." The work before us is marked by intellectual characteristics that are well known to belong to some of the rest of that distinguished family. The thinking is earnest, but erratic. It accepts modern spiritualism and seeks to give it Biblical form and support. "The Bible," says Mr. Beecher, "is the spiritualist's main dependence—to invalidate its historical character, is to break down his best witness." After setting forth the fact of the spiritualistic movement in our day, with instances of mysterious phenomena, disclosures by planchette, second sight, visions, &c., he goes through Biblical history, interpreting its chief events and facts in accordance with the theory. Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles are accepted as true "mediums" whose teachings are to be received. The Kardecian theory of the pre-existence of human souls is adopted. In man they are incarnate, for purposes of deliverance from moral evil, and full training into blessed character; and so nearly all the accepted nomenclature of New Testament theology is turned into the service of this sort of spiritualism. On Mr. Beecher's principles of interpretation the Bible can be made to teach anything. His book will carry no force with men of clear logical judgment.

At the Back of the Moon; or Observations of Lunar Phases. By A. Lunar Wray. pp. 130. 1879.

This is a satire, in verse. The writer represents himself as, in a dream, transported by some ærial navigators to the back of the Moon, and as seeing and hearing, among the lunar folk some ways and customs which he uses to carricature and ridicule some of the institutions and manners of men. Here and there some human folly is well hit off. But the effort is not of a high order. The satire is indiscriminate—except that the writer's antipathies seem to have led him to discriminate against Christianity and the Church. Only a feeble "Lunar Wray" could fail to see that, whatever may be said about it, Christianity is not a subject of ridicule.

"*Saying the Catechism,*" Seventy Five Years ago, and the Historical Results. An Address delivered before the New England Historic-Geneological Society, Dec. 4, 1878. By Dorus Clarke, D. D., Boston. pp. 46. 1879.

We make an exception of this pamphlet, and call special attention to it as worth more than many a large volume of discussion. The simple statement of the facts, showing what the indoctrination of the young in the truths of Christianity, through the Catechism, has done in and for Westhampton, Mass., conveys impressively a lesson that ought to be learned throughout our whole land. The address should be read everywhere.

HOUGHTON, OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.
For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Heredity. With Preludes on Current Events. Boston Monday Lectures. By Joseph Cook. pp. 268. 1879,

Mr. Cook is doing a great and good work. The cause of truth has in him an able and fearless defender whose services ought not to fail of fullest recognition. The eagerness manifested in some directions to discredit his accuracy and his competency to speak on divers points involved in his discussions, itself indicates the force these discussions are felt to have. It is true that here and there he has failed to sustain his views on minor or collateral points, or meet all the difficulties in some of the high questions considered. This was inevitable from the broad and diversified range his of subjects, covering the field of many specialists. But if his hostile critics have convicted him of an occasional mistake, Mr. Cook has held up under the light of clear and severe exposure scores of the pretentious claims of materialistic and anti-Christian speculation.

This is the fifth of the volumes of lectures. The subject is one of very great importance, and only lately submitted to scientific investigation. It involves many profound problems. The points discussed are: *Hereditary Descent in Ancient Greece; Maudsley on Hereditary*

Descent; Necessary Beliefs Inherent in the Plan of the Soul; Darwinian Theory of Pangenesis; Darwin on the Origin of Conscience; What causes Unlikeness in Organisms; Lotze on the Union of the Soul and Body; The Two-fold Identity of Parent and Offspring; Seven principal Laws of Heredity; The Descent of Bad Traits and Good. The lecture on Darwin's account of Conscience may be mentioned as an especially clear showing of the self-contradictions and absurdity of that scientist's statement of its origin. They are all marked by the force and brilliancy that are the well known characters of the lecturer's thought and style. The book is a volume for the times.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

The New Testament; or, The Book of the Holy Gospel of our Lord and our God, Jesus the Messiah. A literal translation from the Syriac Peshito Version. By James Murdock, D. D. pp. ix., 515. 1879.

This is a new edition of a work first printed in 1851. It is not the kind of a volume to become very popular, and yet the publication of this new edition is evidence that it is not wholly lacking in interest. To biblical scholars, the Syriac Version of the New Testament, and this translation of it by Dr. Murdock, will always possess interest and value. It is well known that the Syriac is one of the oldest if not the very oldest, version of the New Testament. The translation was made and in use as early as the century immediately succeeding that of the apostles, and into a language substantially the same as that which was the vernacular of the Divine Teacher and His first preachers of the Gospel. It has always been highly esteemed by scholars for its faithful rendering of the original, and the testimony it furnishes to the trustworthy character of the originals of the New Testament. This version was made at so early a date, that in the earliest form, a few of the later books of the New Testament—second epistle of Peter, second and third epistles of Jude, and the Apocalypse—did not find a place. They have been supplied from later translations. Some spurious passages are also wanting, whilst this Version bears witness to the existence at that early day of some passages deemed doubtful by critics.

The study of Syriac has not been very general even among respectable biblical scholars. Up to the time of this translation, we believe, no rendering of the Syriac Version into English had been published. It is to the credit of the translator that he led the way in his work. He engaged in the study and pursued it as a delight, and he tells us that he longed to have others share with him the exquisite pleasure which he derived from the study of this Version, distinguished for its artless simplicity, directness, and transparency of

style. It must be a great satisfaction to all lovers of the divine Word, to read this literal translation of the old Syriac Version, and compare it with our own admirable Version. The agreement is very close, and shows how accurately we have had conveyed through different channels the treasures of divine truth. By careful, thoughtful students of the Word of God, this translation will be highly prized. To them it will serve various critical purposes. As a specimen of this translation, we give the Lord's Prayer: "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name: Thy kingdom come: Thy will be done; as in heaven, so on earth: Give us our needful bread, this day: And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors: And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever: Amen." The critical reader will notice, that in some cases it keeps closer to the original Greek than does our English Version, and also that this Syriac Version contained at that early day the doxology, the genuiness of which is now a matter of dispute. We are glad of the publication of this new edition of Murdock's translation of this very ancient Version of the New Testament, and very cordially commend it to the attention of our ministers, and all who are interested in the study of the Bible.

Lectures on the History of Ancient Philosophy. By William Archer Butler, M. A., Late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin. Edited from the Authors MSS. with Notes, By William Hepworth Thompson, M. A., Fellow of Trinity College, and Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge. In two volumes, vol. I. pp. 436, Vol. II. pp. 415. 1879.

The publication of a new edition of these lectures, of William Archer Butler, by the well known house of *Robert Carter and Brothers*, shows that they are appreciated by a discerning public. Works of this class soon pass into the vast ocean where so many are buried, unless they have real merit to keep them from oblivion. The world is by no means willing that these productions of a singularly gifted mind should thus perish. They were first published in England, in 1855, seven years after the lamented death of the author; and now after nearly a quarter of a century, and after numerous other works traversing the same field, still a new edition is called for. The case of W. Archer Butler furnishes a striking example of how much may be accomplishsd in a comparatively short life. He reached but his thirty-fifth year, and yet in that time he had established a reputation as a profound thinker, an exact scholar, a brilliant writer, and an eloquent preacher of the gospel. His sermons take a high rank among the models of the English pulpit, and these lectures are the most readable and popular presentation of Ancient Philosophy. They labor

under the disadvantage of not having received the author's final touches and preparation for the press; and yet no doubt the very fact that they were written to be delivered to a listening audience, gives them a freshness and freedom which are not common in the treatment of such high and difficult subjects.

These lectures embrace several successive Series more or less complete. There is first, an Introductory Series, of seven lectures, on the general subject of Metaphysical Science and its pursuit; then what is called the *First Series*, of seven more, on the various systems of Ancient Philosophy, down to the time of Socrates. Then comes a *Second Series*, of nine lectures, beginning with Socrates and his followers, and embracing the leading points in the philosophy of Plato, which are supplemented, however, by a *Third* and *Fourth Series*, of six, and three lectures respectively, including the followers of Plato. The last unfinished *Series*, of three lectures, is devoted to the psychology of Aristotle. From this very imperfect outline of the course of these lectures, it will be seen that the philosophy of Plato occupies a most prominent place, and there can be little doubt but the author had a greater sympathy with Plato, than with any other of the philosophers whose systems he undertook to expound. There are some very manifest points of resemblance between the "divine Plato" and this enthusiastic student and expounder of his philosophy. The brilliant imagination, the intense love of philosophy, the ardent pursuit of truth, the glowing eloquence, are common to both. No one can read their writings without feeling that there is something truly noble and inspiring in their teaching.

The publishers in bringing out this edition, place it within the reach of all who are interested in such studies.

Sermons, Doctrinal and Practical. By the Rev. William Archer Butler, M. A., late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin. Edited, with a Memoir of the author's life, by the very Rev. Thomas Woodward, M. A., dean of Down. Two volumes. pp. 474 and 408. 1879. For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

These sermons, forming the two fine volumes before us, were first published in Dublin in 1849. They have taken their place among the standard volumes of sermons. And rightly; for they are of very high excellence. They are not only evangelical and earnest, but are marked by rare clearness and vigor of thought, deep insight into spiritual truth, and a strong grasp especially upon the great leading and abiding principles of the gospel and of Christian life. They belong to that class of able and substantial discussions of religious truth and duty, that generally hold a permanent place in the Church. Though Butler's sincere and ardent devotion to the polity and order of the Episcopal Church becomes very manifest in many of the discourses,

his earnest piety, as well as deep insight into the essential nature of Christianity, kept him from bigotry or intolerance; and Christians of every name will find in them the holy truths of our "common salvation," presented and vindicated with impressive force and rich suggestiveness.

The two volumes contain fifty sermons, some predominantly doctrinal, others more immediately directed to the practical duties of life. That on "Self Delusion as to our state before God," has been instanced as a specimen of "searchingly practical" preaching. Probably the most elaborate, as well as most widely known, of these discourses, is that preached at the Visitation of the united dioceses of Derry and Raphœ, entitled "Primitive Church Principles not inconsistent with universal Christian Sympathy." It was meant to point out how Churchmen may consistently give a loving recognition to Christian excellence in believers not connected with the Episcopal Church. Whatever we may think of the argument, or, considering the relative size of the Episcopal organization, of the fitness of the illustration in which the "other *little* ships" sailing along with the one in which Christ was, on the Sea of Galilee, are made to represent the "societies that in these late ages have moved in the wake of the ancient Apostolic Church," the discourse shows most clearly the loving Christian spirit of the author.

The very interesting memoir of Prof. Butler, prefixed to the first volume, covers thirty-four pages, and gives just such information as is needed for right understanding of the sermons. Messrs. Carter and Brothers have done a good thing in issuing this attractive edition of these volumes.

NELSON & PHILLIPS, NEW YORK.

Lectures on Preaching, Delivered before the Theological Department of Yale College. By Matthew Simpson, D. D., LL. D., A Bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church. pp. 336. 1879.

The "*Lyman-Beecher Lectureship*" in Yale College is yielding good fruit. This is another volume, embracing ten lectures, by a distinguished divine and bishop of the Methodist Church, and it will be found no unworthy successor to those which had already appeared. The design of these lectures allows of great freedom in the range of topics and discussion, and expects that they will be enlivened and illustrated by personal experiences and reminiscences. They are not intended to furnish treatises on homiletics, but rather to illustrate and apply the theory of preaching. These lectures discuss: The Nature and Work of the Christian Ministry: The Call to the Ministry: The Preacher Personally: Indirect Preparation for the Pulpit: The Preparation of a Sermon: Delivery of a Sermon: Ministerial Power: The Influence of the Pastorate on the Pulpit: Collateral and Miscellaneous Work:

Is the Modern Pulpit a Failure. The lectures are characterized by large common sense, singular simplicity of style and directness of address, and the entire absense of anything pretentious, or any attempt at show. They present a very marked contrast in style to some of the preceeding volumes. They have a character of their own, and one that must have impressed the hearers. They read very much like an annimated conversation of one who was full of his subject, and who talked right on, now and then telling his hearers in a very unassuming way what he himself had experienced in the work of the ministry. They are a good specimen of the conversational style of lecturing, though occasionally growing into real eloquence. They treat very largely of the common place matters of the ministry and preaching, yet not in a tame or common place manner. The amount of good common sense and the practical character of tnese lectures will compensate for any lack of other and to some perhaps more attractive qualities. They will serve to enhance bishop Simpson's reputation for true worth, as a large minded and catholic Christian, a sober and judicious scholar, and true servant of Christ. If there is any danger to be apprehended in regard to the numerous publications on the subject of preaching, it is that the matter will be over-done. There is danger of a surfeit. A diligent study of Paul's life and epistles would be worth as much as any half a dozen volumes on preaching.

Elements of General and Christian Theology. By L. T. Townsend, D. D., Author of "Credo," "Sword and Garment," "God-man," "Arena and Throne," "Lost Forever," etc. pp. 79. 1879.

Dr. Townsend is pretty well known as a vigorous and popular writer. This little volume, whilst having some good things in it, cannot add much to the stock of theological science, or to his reputation as a well trained theologian. The relative importance assigned to different topics is very unequal, and in a very brief "*Supplemental Topics,*" we have jumbled in, *The Lord's Day, The Church, Church Sacraments*, and *Church Polity,* in less than three small pages. To many statements we should take exceptions, but have not time or space at present to discuss them.

G. W. FREDRICK, PHILA.

Thirty-three Practical Sermons. By Josph A. Seiss, D. D., Pastor of the Church of the Holy Communion, Philadelphia. Author of "Lectures on the Gospels," "Holy Types," Ecclesia Lutherana," etc. pp. viii., 160. 1870.

These Sermons, we are informed, are simply a reprint of what appeared in the Pulpit Department of the *Lutheran and Missionary.* This will account for the rather unusual style in which they are here published—large double column page. Such an arrangement enables the publisher to furnish them at a comparatively moderate cost.

Whilst not as elaborate as most of the author's published discourses, they furnish perhaps a better exhibition of his average preaching, and for familiar reading in the family are better adapted than others more rhetorical in style. They can hardly claim a very high place as models of sermonizing, but they will be found instructive, and quickening in earnest, holy living. They are vastly superior to a great many of the empty, flashy publications, entitled sermons, which are only too common at the present day. They are marked by good sound sense, earnestness of address, and practical application of the truth to heart and life.

HARPER AND BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

A History of the Church of England from the accession of Henry VIII. to the Silencing of the Convocation in the Eighteenth Century. By G. G. Perry, M. A., Canon of Lincoln and Rector of Waddington, with an Appendix containing a sketch of the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. By J. A. Spencer, S. T. D., Editor of "The New Testament in Greek, with notes on the Historical Books," etc. pp. xiv., 690. 1879.

This volume will supply a long felt want—a compact, yet comprehensive and satisfactory history of the Church of England. This prominent ecclesiastical body has had no history that satisfied in any reasonable degree the wishes both of scholars and general readers. There have been numerous works treating of particular parts or periods, or discussing the lives of eminent persons and their influence, but no general work combining the various features of the present one. The author seems to have made use of the most valuable materials, and to have aimed at presenting a clear and full account of all the leading facts and events necessary to a proper understanding of that most important part of history, in which we are all so deeply interested. For it is not to members of that Church alone that such a history has interest and value, but to all who read the English language, or who care for the progress of the Protestant faith. This work is an example of multum in parvo. The volume is of moderate size, yet in numbers over seven hundred pages, and these pages are crowded with facts and authorities. The paper is fine, and the print small though distinct, so that a great deal is crowded into so narrow a compass. The work is supplied with the most needful helps for convenience in reading or reference. A full table of Contents, divided into forty chapters, with the years embraced in each on, is prefixed to the volume. Each Chapter has a very full heading, dividing it into paragraphs, and usually has also appended Notes and Illustrations. At the close of the volume are furnished a Table of Succession of English Kings, Archbishops of Canterbury, and Popes: a Chronological table of Events: and a full Index, this last covering twenty-two pages.

This American Edition is further enhanced in value by "A Sketch of the History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," from the pen of J. A. Spencer, S. T. D., covering about sixty pages. This is a very valuable work, one of substantial merit and permanent usefulness, and must be hailed as an important addition to our historical literature.

Bedouin Tribes of the Euphrates By Lady Anne Blunt Edited, with a Preface and some account of the Arabs on their horses By W. S. B. Maps and Sketches By the author. pp. 445. 1879.

The author of this charming volume, Lady Anne Blunt, is the granddaughter of Lord Byron. She seems to possess a romantic and adventurous spirit. She had already explored the Sahara South of the Atlas range, and now has given us an intensely interesting volume of her travels and experience among the Bedouin Tribes of the Euphrates. This is not a volume made up of what is gathered from the observations of others, but one that presents what was seen and heard, and experienced, by a true woman in her intercourse with these wandering tribes. It reads almost like a fairy-tale, or the records of thousands of years ago. It is, however, a record of genuine life as lived a year ago, or as life now is in that country. Next to visiting that land, and seeing for ourselves is the reading of such a book. No one who takes up this volume to read will care to lay it down without finishing it. Everything is fresh and life like—a volume to please and instruct.

English Men of Letters. Edited by John Morely,
Goldsmith, by William Black. pp. 152. 1879.
Hume, by Professor Huxley. pp. 206. 1879.

In the first of these volumes we have a very pleasing sketch of the life and writings of Oliver Goldsmith. The details are not very minute or critical, but sufficient to satisfy the ordinary reader, and everything presented with an air of frankness and candor. Goldsmith had weaknesses, and these are not turned into virtues; but he also had virtues, and these are neither concealed nor unduly exalted. His various literary productions are so treated as to give a historical character to them. It is a volume that cannot fail to afford much gratification to the reader.

The second of these volumes would very naturally invite a more extended criticism, but we shall forbear to indulge the critical propensity. Hume has evidently found a very sympathizing biographer in Professor Huxley. It is meet that it should be so. Yet he deals rather sparingly with his life, devoting less than fifty pages to the biographical part. The author is manifestly more at home in the second part, devoted to his philosophy. He is an ardent admirer of Hume as a philosopher. It may seem a little strange to find him so frequently appealing to Kant, and striving to show the essential agree-

ment between these two distinguished authors. It has been commonly understood that Hume and Kant represented quite different schools of thought. But Professor Huxley would make his subject quite orthodox in philosophy and morals, and scarcely heretical in religion.

It may be well to have the better side presented for our condsideration. Hume has long been in bad odor as a philosopher and a skeptic—or rather as the great leader of skepticism both on philosophy and religion. It is perhaps a favorable indication that even Huxley does not seem to care to glory in his universal skepticism. Sir James MacKintosh has well said of Hume's skepticism: "Whatever attacks every principle of belief can destroy none." Professor Huxley cannot save it from self destruction.

L. Annæus Seneca. Treatises On Providence, On Tranquility of Mind, On Shortness of Life, On Happy Life. Together with select Epistles, Epigrammata, an Introduction, copious Notes, and Scripture Parallelisms. By John F. Hurst, D. D., President of Drew Theol. Seminary, Madison, N. J., and Henry C. Whiting, Ph. D., Prof. of Anc. Languages in the Christian Collegiate Institute, Hackettstown, N. J. pp. 308. 1877.

There are many strong reasons for a more general use of the essays of this great Roman moralist in the Latin course of our Colleges. The above edition is everything that can be desired for the class-room. The introduction gives a brief, interesting sketch of the great writer's life, and his relations to his times and Christianity. The passages collected from his works corresponding to New Testament teaching show the high ethical views he had reached. The publishers have issued the work in clear type, and excellent paper, making pages that delight the eye and help the student.

M. Tullii Ciceronis De Natura Deorum De Divinatione De Fato Recognovit Reinholdus Klotz. pp. 291.

This is another of Harper's Greek and Latin Texts. The neatness and cheapness of these volumes are too well known to classical students to need any explanations. This volume includes some of the most famous of Cicero's discussions. Especially is the one, De Natura Deorum, now of interest, when men are renewing old questions about religion and divine worship. It would surprise some, who at the present day, talk as if they had made great progress in religious thought, and had outlived the old faith, to discover that their crude notions had been discussed thousands of years ago. We commend this volume to some of our advanced thinkers, as well as to all who are interested to know what the best unaided reason can say and do in religion.

SHELDON AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

American Authors. Washington Irving. By David J. Hill, Professor

in the University at Lewisburg; author of Elements of Rhetoric and Composition," and Science of Rhetoric." With a Portrait on Steel. pp. 234. 1879.

This is the first of a Series of American Authors, somewhat after the style of *English Men of Letters* by Morley. It is to embrace among others, Irving, Bryant, Poe, Hawthorne, Prescott, Motley, Cooper, Longfellow, Emerson, and Whittier. This volume is by Prof. Hill, who it seems is to prepare the Series. It may well be doubted whether any one man can satisfactorily accomplish such a task, dealing with so much diversity of character and style. Prof. Hill was already known as an author, and this first volume of the Series shows facility in writing, and ability for such a work. If the volumes are well prepared, they can hardly fail of great popularity. Many readers desire just such works—to have, in a moderate compass and at a moderate cost, satisfactory information about our leading American authors and their works. This first volume introduces one of our best known and favorite authors, and the successive ones will be looked for with interest.

LUTHERAN CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Joh. Guilielmi Baieri Compendium Theologiae Positivae, Adjectis Notis Amplioribus, quibus Doctrina Orthodoxa ad παιδειαν Academicam Atque ex Scriptura S. Eique Innixis Rationibus Theologicis Confirmatur, Denuo Edendum Curavit C. F. W. Walther. Editio Auctior et Emendatior. Vol. I. Tom. 1, 2, 3. 1879.

This is the publication of Baier's Compend with additional notes selected from various distinguished Lutheran authorities, by Dr. C. F. W. Walther. It promises to be a work of special value to Lutheran ministers and students of theology. The additional notes swell very materially the work, and will greatly increase its value as a text-book or manual for theological study. It is published in parts, three of which have already reached us. The first two parts, numbering 190 pages, with a brief life of the author, and a Dedication and Preface included in the third part, are to make up the first volume. It is printed on good paper and with singular neatness, although we regret to see a number of corrections already noted. We hail the appearance of this work with pleasure, and call the attention of our Ministers and theological students to its sterling merits. Its completion will be watched with interest.

Του εν Αγιοις Πατρος Ημων Αθανασιου αρχιεπισκοπου Αλεξανδρειας Επιστολη. pp. 60. 1879.

This is the famous Epistle of Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, in defense of the Nicene Definition. It argues well for the learning and enterprise of our Missouri brethren, that they are publishing this for use in the original Greek. It is a neat and cheap edition.

Communism and Socialism. Minutes of the First German Evangelical Lutheran Congregation U. A. C., at St. Louis, Mo. A Stenographic Report of Four Lectures delivered, and by Resolution of the Congregation published, by Prof. C. F. W. Walther, D. D. Translated from the German by D. Simon, A. M., Luth. Pastor at Indiana, Pa. pp. 76. 1879.

This is a very earnest discussion from a religious standpoint of a threatening evil. Dr. Walther handles the subject with vigor.

G. I. JONES AND COMPANY, ST. LOUIS.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Short History of German Literature. By James K. Hosmer, Professor of English and German Literature, Washington University, St. Louis; Author of "The Color Guard," "The Thinking Bayonet," etc. pp. xi., 591. 1879.

This is a very readable and instructive volume on the subject of which it treats. It aims to be popular in style and in the treatment of the topics introduced. The writer has not limited himself to a dry discussion of German Literature, but has indulged in historical digressions and descriptions of homes and scenes made familiar by some of the authors criticised, or by personal visits. The work is divided into two general parts, the first extending to the Thirty Years' War, the second extending from that period to the present time. The leading German authors are criticised with freedom and good taste, showing a wide range of reading and familiar acquaintance with the subject. The work will supply a want which many have felt. It is a glaring defect that it has no Index, and even the *Table of Contents* is without paging to show where the different Chapters are to be found.

D. LOTHROP AND COMPANY, BOSTON.

Young Folks' History of Germany. By Charlotte M. Yonge, Author of "The Heirs of Redclyffe," "Book of Golden Deeds," "Young Folks' History of Greece," etc. pp. 474.

The author is already known as a popular writer, and has before written History for the Young. This history of Germany, from the earliest times to the present day, will be found very entertaining and instructive for this class of readers. The Illustrations are quite numerous, and although not always striking, may serve to fasten the facts and scenes on the mind. The use of the German form of names instead of the English equivalents, for English readers, is of questionable propriety. Its table of *Contents* and simple chronological order make the understanding of the volume ready and easy.

The Sentence and its Parts. An Analytic Syntax for the use of Advanced Classes of Schools, and for Self-Instruction. By Geo. W. Ebeling, Ph. D., Principal of Overlea Home School for Boys, at Ca-

tonsville, Md. pp. 64. Sold by the author, Rev. Geo. W. Ebeling, Catonsville, Md.

A Manual of Important Facts, concerning the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By Rev. Edwin Potter. pp. 28. Worcester, N. Y.

The Hebrew New Testament, by Prof. Franz Delitzsch, 2d revised edition. 1878.

Complutensische Varianten zum Alttestamentlichen Texte. Ein Beitrag zur biblischen Textkritik von Franz, Delitzsch. Leipzig, 1878.

Both these works, kindly sent us, we take great pleasure in bringing before the Christian reader. Of the Hebrew New Testament we have already given the history in the July number (1878) of this REVIEW. It is very gratifying that the edition of 2500 copies was soon exhausted, and a second one became necessary. It is also a cause of rejoicing that both Jewish and Christian scholars took a special interest in the first edition, and sent their critical remarks to the translator, who made use of them for his second edition. The new edition is not only superior to the first, from a critical standpoint, but also in that the *textus receptus* has been adopted. The first edition was based on the text of the Codex Sinaiticus. Since, however, all modern translations are based on the *receptus*, and not on the *Sinaiticus*, the translator has followed the former, but in such way, that later additions, not originally belonging to the text, are marked. The Church in general, but the Lutheran especially, may be thankful that one of her sons has thus been enabled to produce a work, which will be the means of bringing many a one of Abraham's sons to the knowledge of Him, of whom Moses and the prophets have spoken. As to the second work, the *Complutensische Varianten*, pp. 42, 4to, it is an important contribution to the text of the Old Testament. Some years ago, Prof. Delitzsch, in connection with the Jewish scholar, N. S. Baer, commenced a new edition of the Old Testament, of which Genesis, Job, Isaiah, and the minor prophets have already been published. The object of this new edition is not to give a new text, but the so-called masoretic text in accordance with the grammatical rules and regulations laid down by the ancient Jewish grammarians, and in accordance with the readings of the best and most ancient manuscripts and editions. For such an undertaking all available sources must be consulted, and one of the sources is the Hebrew text of the Complutensian Polygot, printed in 1515. It must, however, not be inferred, that the Complutensian text is the first ever printed. The printing of Hebrew had already begun in 1477, and the Hebrew Bible, from which Luther made his German translation, was published in 1494, and is still preserved in the Royal Library at Berlin. But the Complutensian text is one of the earliest recensions of the Hebrew text, and Prof. Delitzsch has given us what he calls Varianten, accompanied with learned notes.

Rochester, N. Y. B. PICK.

CONTENTS OF NO. II.

Article. Page.

I. Art in Its Relalation to Worship in the Lutheran Church,..... 169
By Rev. W. Strobel, D. D., Rhinebeck, New York.

II. Evolution: Shall it be Atheistic?..... 179
By Rev. W. E. Parson, A. M., lately Professor in the Imperial University, Tokio, Japan.

III. Preachers' Sons,..... 200
By Rev. Prof. J. B. Focht, Selinsgrove, Pa.

IV. Origin and History of Premillenarianism,..... 207
By C. A. Briggs, D. D., Professor in Union Theological Sem., N. Y.

V. The Lutheran Church between the Potomac and the Rio Grande,..... 245
By Rev. Wm. E. Hubbert, Blacksburg, Va.

VI. Historical Sketch of Our India Mission,..... 262
By Rev. A. D. Rowe, A. M. Guntoor, India.

VII. The Docsrine of the Lord's Supper,..... 276
*Translated from the German of the Rev. Prof. J. J. Herzog, D. D., of Erlangen, by the Rev. G. F. Behringer, Mendon, Ill.

VIII. Literary Intelligence,..... 295
American.—Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—Poetry—Miscellaneous.

IX. Notices of New Publications,..... 296
Second Free Lutheran Diet in America—My Duty to the Church of which I am a Member—Ten Reasons why I should regularly attend the Public Worship of God—The Fireside Encyclopædia of Poetry—Voices from Babylon—The Englishman's Critical and Expository Bible Cyclopædia—Philosophy, Historical and Critical—Life and Times of Stein—Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religions of India—Bismarck in the Franco-German War 1870-1871—St. Paul at Athens—Epochs of Ancient History—The Dawn of History—Outlines of Ontological Science—The English Reformation—Studies in the Model Prayer—Spiritual Manifestations—At the Back of the Moon—"Saying the Catechism"—Heredity—The New Testament—Lectures on the History of Ancient Philosophy—Sermons—Lectures on Preaching—Elements of General and Christian Theology—Thirty-three Practical Sermons—A History of the Church of England—Bedouin Tribes of the Euphrates—English Men of Letters, Goldsmith, Hume—L. Annæus Seneca—M. Tullii Ciceronis De Natura Deorm De Divinatione De Fato Reconovit Reinholdus Klotz—American Authors—Joh. Guilielmi Baieri Compendium Theologiæ Positivæ—Communism and Socialism—Short History of German Literature—Young Folks' History of Germany—The Sentence and its Parts--The Hebrew New Testament--Complutensische Varianten zum Alttestamentlichen Texte—*Του εν Αγιοις Πατρος Ημων Αθανασιου αρχιεπισκοπου Αλεξανδρειας Επιστολη.*

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JULY, 1879.

ARTICLE I.

THE CHURCH RELATION OF CHILDREN OF BELIEVERS PRIOR TO THEIR BAPTISM, ACCORDING TO THE LUTHERAN DOGMATICIANS.

By M. VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

The single purpose of this article is to present the teaching of some of the chief Lutheran theologians on the relation of the children of Christians to the Church. Exception has, of late, frequently been made to the statement that the offspring of believers are "born in the Church," or that their membership in it is incipiently or fundamentally constituted, under the divine covenant, by their birth. This is looked upon as violating the true conception of baptism as the initiatory sacrament, and is represented as unsound and un-Lutheran. We hear and read the expression of strong dissent: "The children of Christian parents are not born in the Church." The denial is repeated with emphasis, and in form that disallows any qualification: "*Until the child be baptized it is in* NO SENSE *within the Church.*" Baptism, it is contended, brings it in from a position wholly without. This birth-status of the children of believers is, therefore, the sole point on which it is here meant to look at the views of our great, representative dogmaticians. We desire only the truth on this ques-

tion. If the teaching that the offspring of Christians are "born in the Church," and that in some sense they, even before their baptism, "belong to the Church," really be un-Lutheran, we have no wish to claim the contrary. But the proof must be given. The general subject of the relation of the family to the Church, in which this particular point is involved, is one of great doctrinal importance; and it is well to examine and study what these eminent authorities have taught upon it. We wish their testimony to be seen and understood, where it goes against the position we have taken, as well as where we believe it fully recognizes and supports it. The examination will show how expressly and strongly the doctrine that the children of believers are "born in the Church," is taught by highest authorities in Lutheran theology. Many readers of the REVIEW may not have access to these works, or may have shrunk from the trouble of searching out and examining their teaching on this subject.

To the right understanding of their language, in its bearing on the point under inquiry, and especially in order to define this point more precisely, two things must be recalled and kept in mind.

1. That by "the Church" is meant just what our Confessions and dogmaticians make it—"the congregation of all believers and saints among whom the gospel is preached in its purity and the holy sacraments are administered according to the gospel." The two-fold conception of the Church, as in one sense *visible* and in another *invisible*, is constantly recognized by them. By the Church, then, in its full comprehension, we are rightly to understand the divine organization in which the word and sacraments are enjoyed and used. "We do not affirm that there are two Churches, the one true and internal, the other nominal and external; but we say that the Church is one and the same, viz., the entire assembly of the called considered in a two-fold manner, namely, ἔσωθεν [from within] and ἔξωθεν [from without], or with respect to the call and outward association, consisting in the profession of faith and the use of the sacraments; and with respect to inner regeneration and inner association, consisting

in the bond of the Spirit. In the former manner and respect we grant that even hypocrites and those who are not saints belong to the Church, but in the latter manner and respect we contend that only true believers and saints belong to it."* "Although it is by no means sufficient for salvation that you be in the Church, described thus generally, and only with respect to the outward profession of Christian faith, yet salvation itself cannot be found by any one outside of this assembly. And here the comparison of the Church with the ark of Noah is in point. For as no one was saved outside of this while the deluge lasted, and yet not all who were in the ark were saved eternally, so outside of the Church of the called no one is saved, and yet not every one embraced in this vast assembly of the Church is saved."* *Chemnitz*, says: "The Church is the visible assembly of those who embrace the Gospel of Christ and rightly use the sacraments; in which God works through the ministry of the Gospel and regenerates many to eternal life; in which assembly, however, there are many unregenerated [non renati], but consenting concerning the pure doctrine."†

2. That the inquiry is not at all concerning the *internal state* of the children of believers, prior to baptism, but their *external relation or place.* It is whether they are properly considered, by birth, *within the Church* or *outside* of it, whether they belong to the Church or to the world. It is to be distinctly understood that no question is raised as to original sin or the depravity of such children, or that they need, as truly as others, to be regenerated and sanctified through the means of grace. The Church relation is not to be viewed as an equivalent to actual regeneration, or as meaning that *by birth* they are already *internally* and *spiritually* holy. From the two-fold conception of the Church as visible and invisible, it follows that membership cannot be understood as always and necessarily the same as regeneration. Nor is it to be understood that the Church-membership, as thus implied, is membership

**Gerhard*, Conf. Cath. Quoted from Schmid's Dogmatik.

†*Hutter*, Loci C. Th. See Schmid's Dogmatik.

‡*Loci Theologici*, De Ecclesia.

in its fullest sense and *completed* form. Church-membership reaches its fullest sense in the inner spiritual union, by faith, with Christ's mystical spiritual body. It reaches its *completed form* when the relation is *sealed* and declared in the sacrament of holy baptism. But it is maintained that the relation, though initial and inchoate, is yet real—that thus, in a true sense, these children of believers are *born in the Church*, with right to its sealing ordinance and sacramental grace; so that baptism may be looked upon not so much as creating or forming the relation *ab initio*, and transferring from a position outside of the Church to one within, as *sealing* and completing a relation formed in its initial or incipient stage by the terms of God's covenant, and as beginning the application of the means of regeneration and saving grace, in the Church, for the spiritual renewal which such sealed Church-membership implies. Is this view repudiated by the theology of our Church? We translate and present from the following dogmaticians, as the great authorities in the older theology of the Lutheran Church, enough, we think, to give the reader the testimony of each of them on this subject. They are named in chronological order.

CHEMNITZ.

Loci Theologici, *De Baptisimo.*—"The sacramentarians contend that the infants of believers, simply because of their being born of believing parents, are, even without baptism and before they are baptized, not children of wrath, but children of God, not without, but in the kingdom of heaven; that baptism is only an external sign, because they are already heirs of eternal life. But, because by this reasoning the truth of original sin is impaired and the saving efficacy of baptism is dangerously undervalued, we must oppose to it the sure and clear testimony of Scripture concerning the ordinary means of regeneration. For, even believing parents beget their children carnal, not after the Spirit, but after the flesh. The principle, therefore, is general, embracing even the children of believers: 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and unless born of water and the Spirit cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven', John 3 : 5, 6. Thus David, although born of circumcised and believing parents, confesses that he was conceived and born in sin,

Ps. 51 : 7. And St. Paul, Eph. 2 : 3, says: 'We also, (though we have been born of circumcised parents), were by nature the children of wrath even as others.' The promise of grace and of the kingdom of heaven pertains, indeed, not only to the parents, but also to their children, Gen. 17 : 7 ; Acts 2 : 39. But the promise does not profit unless an application of it be made, Heb. 4 : 2 : 'For unto you was the gospel preached as well as unto them, but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. For we which have believed do enter, into rest.' Thus Christ says, 'that which is born of the flesh,' must be born again or regenerated, John 3 : 5. But the application of the promise and of regeneration does not take place by carnal generation. For the decision is universal : 'By the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation,' Rom. 5 : 18. But baptism is the ordinary means, that is the washing of regeneration, Tit. 3 : 5, whereby those who are born of the flesh and are not in the kingdom of heaven, are born again of water and the Spirit, and so enter into the kingdom of heaven, John 3 : 5. For they are baptized for remission of sins, Acts 2 : 38, that the sins in which they have been born may be washed away, Acts 22 : 16, and that they may be cleansed and saved by the washing of regeneration, Eph. 5 : 26 ; Tit. 3 : 5. * * *

Certain sacramentarians contend that baptism is only an external declaration and testimony of what God works within, either before or apart from, or without baptism. For this reason it is to be taught from the word of God, that baptism is an action in which God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, through the external ministry, exhibits to us, confirms and applies the promise of grace. And because some begin to debate whether it is rightly said, in Luther's Catechism, that baptism works remission of sins, frees from death and the power of the devil, and gives eternal life to those who believe, since these are the peculiar benefits of Christ, this declaration must be clearly and distinctly set forth, that the virtue and efficacy of baptism is by no means to be attributed to the element of water or the external action of the ministry ; but because baptism is an action in which through the washing of water in the word, God the Father, on account of the Son as Mediator, saves us by the application and sealing of the promise of grace, according to Tit. 3 : 5, the Son sanctifies and cleanses, Eph. 5 : 26, the Holy Spirit regenerates, John 3 : 5 ; that being justified by the grace of Christ, into whose death and resurrection we are baptized, and whom

we have put on in baptism, we may have the answer of a good conscience toward God and be heirs of eternal life, Tit. 3 : 5 ; Rom. 6 : 3 ; Pet. 3 : 31. Therefore, the virtue, work and efficacy of baptism is of God Himself, who works, gives and effects such things, not immediately, but through the washing of water in the Word."

In these passages, Chemnitz seems to look upon the children of believers as wholly without, prior to baptism, but an analysis of his statements shows that they contain no positive support to such view :

1. He holds firmly and fully to the Scripture teaching, accepted, as it must be, by all Lutherans, that the offspring of believers as well as others are born in orignal sin, are depraved, and cannot be saved except through regeneration by the grace and work of God.

2. By entering into "the kingdom of heaven"—phraseology from John 3 : 5—he means passing into an actually regenerate state.

3. As he defines the Church as the "visible assembly of those who accept the Gospel of Christ, &c., among whom there may be some "unregenerate," "the kingdom of heaven," in his phraseology, is not a synonym or equivalent of the *Church.* Chemnitz' denial, therefore, that the children of believers are born in the "kingdom of heaven," is no denial that they are born in the Church—the meaning being only that they, as truly as others, are born with a corrupt nature and need to be regenerated in the birth of water and the Spirit. If we add, yet, the doctrine—concerning which he says nothing—that by force of the covenant with believing parents God counts the children as by birth within the Church, with an inchoate membership awaiting formal completion and the application of appointed sacramental grace, there will be full place for the office of baptism as set forth in Chemnitz' own words, when he describes the sacrament as "an action in which through the washing of water in the word, God the Father, on account of the Son as Mediator, saves us by the application and sealing of the promise of grace, the Son sanctifies and cleanses, and the Holy Ghosts regenerates."

GERHARD.

Loci Theologici, Loc. xxi. Cap. viii., 198.—"Since we have now shown that infants are to be baptized, a further inquiry arises: What infants are to be baptized? We answer, that the way to baptism is open to the infants of Christians. But by this term we understand, (1) Those who have been born of Christian parents, that is, whose parents profess the Christian faith, embrace the word and use the sacraments, although they should be destitute of true and saving faith, and not be in the number of the elect; in Gen. 17 : 7, God promises to be *the God of Abraham and of his seed.* In virtue of this promise, Abraham circumcised not only Ishmael thirteen years old, but also Isaac on the eighth day, Gen. 21 : 4. Wherefore, since we, Christians, in the covenant, are no longer *strangers from the covenants of promise, Eph. 2 : 12, but are made nigh*, this promise pertains also to us; and therefore by the force of this promise not only our adult children, but also infants are to be admitted to baptism which has taken the place of circumcision, Col. 2 : 11; Acts 2 : 38: 'Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, (v. 33), for the promise is to you and your children.' From this, because the promise was made to the Jews and their children, Peter concludes that both ought to receive baptism. Therefore, when Christians in the New Testament are made partakers of this same promise, it follows that their children may and ought to be baptized, Acts 3 : 24: 'Ye are the children of the prophets and of the covenant which God made with your fathers.' 1 Cor. 5 : 12: 'What have I to do to judge them who are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth." *By those who are within, are understood those born in the bosom of the Church.* Those who are in *the bosom of the Church, together with their children use the word and sacraments which are the peculiar goods of the Church; but concerning those who have been born without the Church*, the apostles says: 'What have I to do to judge concerning these.' 1 Cor. 7 : 14: 'For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.' This 'holiness' of children born of Christian parents, is not merely a *political* cleanness, since even outside of the Church there may be a distinction between legitimate and natural or spurious children, nor is it an internal holiness and cleanness of heart, as if the children

of Christians were born holy from their mother's womb, since, not less than others, they are 'conceived and born in sin,' Ps. 51 : 5, and are 'by nature the children of wrath even as others,' Eph. 2 : 3; but the 'holiness' is *ecclesiastical*, that is, that such children, born of Christian parents, or if only one or the other parent is a believer or Christian, *may be considered as born in the Church, and have access to baptism, the sacrament of initiation;* but others who have been born of unbelieving parents are to be considered 'unclean,' that is, to them does not pertain the divine promise: 'I will be thy God and the God of thy seed;' and therefore access to baptism is not open to them equally with the children of Christians, but they must first be instructed and profess the Christian faith when they have grown up. * * * The children born of such marriages [one of the parents being a Christian] are clean and holy, that is, they are to be regarded as Christian children, and not Gentiles, and therefore they are not to be excluded from the Church, but on account of the one believing parent, *they are to be held as born in the bosom of the Church and to be admitted to baptism.* * * *

But thou sayest: all infants are alike by nature, that is, are conceived and born in sin, Ps. 51: 7, and are by nature children of wrath, Eph. 2 : 3 ; therefore no such distinction is made among them, that to some the way is open to baptism, but to others it is closed. We answer, that in respect to original sin all infants are indeed alike; nevertheless there remains this distinction among them, *that some have been born in the bosom and limits of the Church, but some without the Church; to the former pertains the promise, 'I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed,'* Gen. 17 : 7, *'these indeed are clean,'* 1 Cor. 7 : 14; to these access to baptism is at once open in the age of infancy; but to the latter pertains neither the promise of God nor the covenant of grace nor baptism, as long as neither they nor their parents embrace the Christian religion, but they are strangers from the covenants of promise, Eph. 2 : 12.

To the question whether the children of Christian parents are, prior to baptism, in the *covenant of God* and holy—whether as Calvin taught, "infants have need of baptism not as a necessary aid to salvation, but only as a seal for sealing the grace of adoption in them," Gerhard says:

"Our judgment is this, that the children of Christians really enjoy this prerogative, that in the age of infancy, be-

fore they can be instructed in the true religion, they can and ought to be baptized ; yet in the meantime, before baptism, they are not, on account of their birth from Christian parents, in the covenant of God, nor holy, but are by nature children of wrath, not less than the children of unbelievers, and moreover, need baptism that they may be regenerated to eternal life."

The testimony of Gerhard must carry great weight on this point, from the high rank he holds among the Lutheran dogmaticians. That he positively asserts the essential points of the doctrine in question, becomes apparent by a little review of points in his statements:

1. That "as to original sin all infants are alike, or equal, the children of believers needing regeneration in order to be saved, as truly as the children of the ungodly.

2. That when he rejects Calvin's teaching that the children of believers are "*in the covenant of God and holy*," before their baptism, he takes this phrase, "in the covenant of God," as meaning an inner renewal and holiness, without which no one can enter into the spiritual kingdom of God. For his denial that they are in the "covenant of God" is made on the ground that they, as well as others, "need to be regenerated unto eternal life." He therefore distinguishes between being "in the covenant of God," and "in the Church."

3. That while he denies the former to them, he allows them the latter, and affirms repeatedly and in the unequivocal terms, that *the children of believers* "*are born in the bosom and limits of the Church.*"

4. As he defines the "holiness" of 1 Cor. 7 : 14, according to the consent of nearly all the Lutheran theologians, to be not *internal* purity, but an "*ecclesiastical holiness*," and to mean that by force of the divine covenant such children have been "*born within the Church*"—a relation asserted with emphasis and repeatedly—the "access" of such children to baptism, *aditum ad baptismum*, of which he so frequently speaks as their high and joyful prerogative, must of necessity be from a position "within" and not from without the Church. Baptism does not create the relation from which itself proceeds—does not,

according to him, bring the children of believers into the Church from a position without. The relation "within" is treated as a *reality*, as it must be if it confers a right to a Church sacrament. Having decided the "holiness" to be, not an *internal* renewal, but *ecclesiastical relation*, Gerhard's acutely logical mind saved him from the absurdity of then emptying this relation of all content and reality by assigning to baptism the office of bringing such children into the Church from without—the inconsistency of at the same time asserting and denying the "*ecclesiastical holiness.*" Without doubt, therefore, Gerhard must be accepted as teaching that the Church membership of the children of believers is fundamentally formed by their covenant relation, incipient and inchoate it may be, yet real, awaiting the sealing completion and grace of holy baptism. Though he calls baptism the sacrament of "initiation," his own explicit and repeated statements require us to understand him as connecting the initiatory idea with baptism, in case of these children, not as transferring of their position, but either as sealing and completing their membership in the Church, considered as the visible body of believers, or as introducing them through regeneration into the spiritual body meant by the Church as invisible. The sole office of baptism, as Gerhard presents it, is that it becomes "*the washing of regeneration and of renewal.*"

CALOVIUS.

Biblia Illustrata, 1 Cor. 7 : 14.—"But the latter sense [of an external sanctity] may be more properly applied to the *holiness of the children*, which here is not internal, or of faith or *federal*, as the Calvinists hold. For this is not by *generation*, but by *regeneration.* But it is *external*, or belongs to *communion of the sacraments* and access to the privileges of the Church, which some call *ecclesiastical* holiness, others *political.* But it is not properly *ecclesiastical*, because the privilege of access to the Church does not yet make a member (cives, citizen) of the Church ; nor is it *political*, because it does not arise from *civil* society, nor concern *civil benefits* which possess no holiness. But the 'holiness' is *merely relative*, and is so called only according the *outward name* ; concerning which Baldwin thus holds : 'Since the holiness of the children born of believers, is to be understood as neither

merely civil, nor merely ecclesiastical, nor as spiritual, we may explain it as meaning an intermediate holiness which we may call *Levitical* or *legal*; that is, pertaining to the right and power of obtaining the privileges of members of the Church; just as not every one among the people could perform sacred rites in the temple of God, or tabernacle, but only the Levites who were sanctified through certain ceremonies according to the law,' *Paralip.* xv., 14. And just as not all *vessels* were called *holy*, but such as were devoted to sacred things, and were sanctified for this by certain rites, and the rest were unclean, so not all persons are to be promiscuously admitted to baptism and the benefits connected with it, but such only as have been *born of members of the Church or believing parents. These, therefore, are holy, because they have access to the privileges of the Church*, while to others *who are without*, they are not granted. For this reason *Tertullian*, after the same manner, has called the *candidates of the faith* holy; and *Augustine* interprets the sanctity spoken of by the apostled as referring not to the holiness of faith, but to communion of the sacraments and likeness of profession. But this access and privilege do not yet make a *member of the Church* or a *partaker of the covenant of God*, but this benefit is obtained only in baptism."

HUNNIUS.

Epitome Credendorum, Cap. xxvi.—"Little children are denizens of the covenant of grace. For the Lord Jesus Himself declares that 'of such is the kingdom of heaven, Mark, 10: 14. This covenant is made by baptism, which Peter calls 'an answer of a good conscience toward God,' 1 Pet. 3 : 31. From which follows, that whosoever belongs to the covenant of grace is entitled to receive baptism. Children, we have just seen, belong to the covenant; consequently they must be baptized."*

QUENSTEDT.

Theolgia Didactica Polemica. De Baptismo, Cap. v., Sect. 2.—"There is a difference between the *infants of Christians*, whether born of them or transferred and taken into their guardianship and parental authority, and the *infants of unbelievers*, Pagans, Turks, Jews, who are still under their power. The discussion here is not concerning the latter, but the former. For such as are born without the limits of the

*Quoted from Paul Edward Gottheils Translation, Nuremburg, 1847.

Church, from non-Christian parents, are not indeed excluded from the benefit (of baptism) by any judicial rejection; nevertheless they have not yet a right to the thing, are without, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants, 1 Cor. 5 : 12; Eph. 2 : 2; 1 Cor. 7 : 14. Therefore the infants of unbelievers are not to be violently taken from their parents and baptized."

"The *subjects of baptism* can be considered with respect to essential nature, extent, and kind. In respect to their essential nature, they are *human beings alone*, and these alive. In respect to extent, they are, immediately and *directly*, *only members of the Church* (*cives ecclesiae*); but mediately and *remotely* they are *all nations*, with this limitation, however, that baptism can be conferred upon both adults and infants only in the way and manner which Christ has prescribed. Adults, therefore, are not to be baptized before they have been instructed concerning Christ from the word of God, and profess the Christian religion. This is evident from the command of Christ, Matt. 28 : 19, and the practice of the apostles, Acts 2 : 38; 8 : 37, 38. To the infants of Christians or *to those who have been born in the bosom of the Church* immediate access to baptism is open, as the privilege is described in Gen. 17 : 7. But by infants of Christians we understand those also who have been born of parents, one or the other of whom is a Christian, 1 Cor. 7 : 2; those whose parents have been converted to the Christian faith, even though they were begotten and born in gentilism; and those who by lawful means have been transferred to the guardianship and parental authority of Christians; but those *begotten without the Church*, are, according to the apostle, *unclean*, since to them does not pertain the divine promise: 'I will be thy God, and of thy seed after thee.' In respect to kind, both male and female ought to be baptized, a particular in reference to which a difference obtains between circumcision and baptism. * * *

Distinguish between the natural and the spiritual birth. Not the former but the latter confers grace; that is to be *born of the flesh*, this, to be *born of God.* No one is born in the covenant of God, but being born is received into it. Parents beget children not in virtue of that part in which they are of the Spirit and regenerate, but in virtue of that in which they are flesh, corrupt and unclean. Christians are not, therefore, born Christians, but they become such through baptism. * * *

"A difference exists between infants born without the Church, and infants born within the same. We refer to the

latter, not the former. For the former are not to be judged by the Church, but committed to God, 1 Cor. 5 : 12, 13. Here the Church makes the apostle's distinction between the 'holy' and 'unclean,' 1 Cor. 7 : 14, between those *within* and those *without*, 1 Cor. 5 : 12, or between the children *of the covenant* and those *outside* of it, Acts 3 : 25." * * *

"*Are the infants of Christians holy and in the covenant of God even before they are baptized?* The controversy between us and the Calvinists is not concerning the holiness external, ecclesiastical and potentially convenantal which exhibits a *right* to a thing, [*jus ad rem*], but concerning a holiness spiritual, internal, an actually covenantal holiness, which presents the thing in its reality [*jus in re*]. We concede the former; but that the latter is meant by the Reformed is evident from their clear words, of which Dr. Hutter has gathered very many in his *Irenicum*, p. 319, and what we shall hereafter adduce; that is, the Calvinists attribute to children born in the Church of God a holiness before baptism of such a kind that by it they are so sanctified through the formula of the covenant that they not only have from the womb the heirship of the covenant, but that they are also *in the thing*, as the lawyers say; not only that they enjoy those prerogatives, over and above the children of the Gentiles, or the privilege that to them the way is open to baptism as the sign of the covenant of God, and that they thus belong to the covenant of God and have the right of citizenship, but that they are also actually embraced in the covenant of God. We deny this."

"Although the children of Christian parents enjoy the prerogatives and privileges, above the children of unbelievers, that in infant age, before they are instructed in the true religion, they may and ought to be baptized, nevertheless before baptism, they are not, on account of their birth from Christian parents, in the covenant of God, nor holy, but by nature children of wrath, Eph. 2 : 3."

Cap. II. De Peccato, Sec. II.—"*Objection*—Children are born holy, 1 Cor. 7 : 14, therefore they cannot be in the kingdom of Satan, under the power of the devil and infected by sin. *Answer*: (1) We are to distinguish between ecclesiastical, external, exhibited holiness, and that which is spiritual and inherent. In this passage *the former* is referred to, for the children of believers belong to the Church and to the covenant; and not *the latter*, because the regenerate beget children not by virtue of their being regenerate, but by virtue of being men and animals. Whence infants are born flesh of flesh, and are by nature children of wrath. (2) The Socini-

ans regard infants as neither holy nor as sinners, but as intermediate."

BAIER.

Compendium Theologiæ Positivæ, Part III. Cap. x. Sec. 8.—"However, we believe that the children of believing parents, if deprived of baptism, are regenerated and saved by an *extraordinary* grace of God; but the unbaptized children of unbelievers we commit to the *divine judgment*; nor dare we, indeed, violently take them from unwilling parents, and baptize them. * *

For, although there may not be expressly revealed in Scripture any *determinate mode of dealing with the unbaptized infants of believers through extraordinary grace, and of working in them regeneration and faith*, and so *applying to them the merit of Christ;* nevertheless, resting *on theological reasons*, obtained from Scripture, we are able to entertain a pious and confident hope concerning such *extraordinary regeneration* of their infants. See *Musaeus*, Ausfuhrl. Erklärung, Q, 61, p. 358. So *Gerhard*, L. C., says '*Concerning infants born in the Church, we may more reasonably cherish hope.*"

HOLLAZ.

Examen Theologicum Acroamaticum. Part III. Sec. ii. Cap. iv.—"The infants of Christians before reception of baptism possess an external or ecclesiastical holiness, or as of the Church, but do not possess an internal holiness or of faith. The promise of the covenant belongs to them, but they are not yet in an exhibited covenant.

1 Cor. 7 : 14. 'But now are your children holy. An external or ecclesiastical holiness is referred to, which consists in this, that the infants of believers have a direct access to divine grace, and so to a participation in the means through which, by divine ordination, eternal salvation is conferred. *For they have been born within the limits of the Church* [*castra ecclesiæ*] and have right to the thing, although they do not yet possess the thing in reality, [*in re*], *i. e.*, they have immediate access to divine covenant grace, but are not yet actually partakers of the divine covenant grace. The holiness is said to be ecclesiastical, not as if unbaptized infants of Christians were citizens or members of the Church, but because they have the right and power of obtaining the privileges of members of the Church, which are not so easily granted to others who are without. This holiness is called external by Calovius, in *Biblia Illustra*, on 1 Cor. 7, a *holiness merely relative*,

and is such *according to outward name.* * * * To the infants of believers the divine covenant is indeed promised, but not yet exhibited or applied, Gen. 17 : 10; Acts 2 : 39–41. For since the promise of the covenant is conditional, or dependent on being circumcised or baptized, infants are not actually inserted in the divine covenant before receiving the sacrament of initiation."

BUDDEUS.

Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae. Lib. V. Cap. 1, De Baptismo.—"But it is evident from Eph. 2 : 3, that infants born of the flesh and thus carnal are consequently also '*children of wrath;*' and this can be denied by no one, unless he call in question original sin. It follows, therefore, that they should be baptized, unless they ought to remain in that state which, should they die, draws upon itself eternal death. We grant, indeed, that to infants born of Christian parents, a certain external and ecclesiastical holiness can be attributed, Rom. 11 : 16; 1 Cor. 7 : 14; but we cannot persuade ourselves that these possess an internal holiness and are so cleansed from sin, that, although unbaptized, they ought to be held in the number of the children of God and to be considered heirs of eternal life, as the Anabaptists and others contend. For that it is otherwise, is evident from Eph. 2 : 3; Job 14 : 4, and other places which we have already adduced in treating of original sin. Our view concerning the baptism of infants is strengthened by what the evangelists, Matthew, 19 : 13, seq.; Mark, 10 : 13, seq.; Luke, 18 : 15, seq., relate concerning the little children brought to Christ. * * *

"Concerning infants that die without baptism, to add another thing, a distinction is to be observed between the infants of Christians or of those who are living in the Church, and of those without. As to the former, it is agreed among almost all, that they are not lost; since according to the well-known principle of Augustine, it is not the privation, but contempt that condemns. And rightly indeed, since no one has so held that the children of the Israelites, dying before the eighth day, or their females, were lost because they died before circumcision, or circumcision did not pertain to them. Those who here have recourse to the mediate knowledge of God [*scientiam Dei mediam*],* and suppose those are saved

* The "mediate knowledge" of God, is His fore-knowledge of the contingent acts of his creatures, a knowledge of future possibilities, in hypothetical conditions. "Omnes itaque hominum angelorumque non tantum actiones, sed cogitationes quoque atque decreta, in illis

whom God fore-saw would believe on Christ, and those lost whom He fore-saw would not believe, are not to be heard; since no one can be either saved or condemned on account of what has no actual existence. But those who agree in this, that the children of Christian parents are saved, fail, however, to agree as to the way in which they are saved. It cannot be denied that the offspring of Christian parents who are in the covenant of grace with God, possess a certain prerogative above the children of unbelievers; and this is rightly gathered from Gen. 17 : 7, and Acts 2 : 39. But this, unless something further is added, is not sufficient to make them actual partakers of eternal salvation. So also, it appears from what has already been said, the ecclesiastical and external holiness which belongs to the children of Christian parents, is not sufficient for this. And plainly, if for this reason eternal salvation be conferred on infants, it must be said, either that the covenant relation itself or external ecclesiastical holiness suffices for salvation, or that faith is produced through that relation and the outward fellowship of the Church; neither of which, however, can be maintained without involving the greatest difficulties. Therefore, nothing remains but to say, that in children of Christian parents, dying before baptism, faith is produced through some extraordinary grace. Why God does not equally grant this grace to the children of unbelievers, may, not without reason, be derived from the prerogative which Christians have over unbelievers on account of the covenant of grace."

More of our dogmaticians might be quoted. But it is unnecessary. These eight may justly be taken as representative Lutheran theologians of the older school, and as among the highest authorities. The extracts given have been selected as containing the clearest statements found in their works on the subject. In analyzing and questioning their testimony, we find the following facts:

1. That while these theologians, without dissent, reject the unscriptural idea that the children of believers are, by birth, internally and spiritually holy, and assert their natural depravity, they are equally unanimous in maintaining that

---

unquam exstitura, cum intime cognoscat, sequitur, ignotum illi esse non posse, quid homines, angelique, posita certa quadam conditione, facturi fuissent; quam scientiam de *futuro conditionato,* itemque *mediam* vocare solent; quae et scripturæ itidem nititur testimoniis." Buddeus, Lib. II., Cap. I. Sec. 22.

such children sustain SOME *relation to the Church different from that of children born of those without*—a relation defined usually by the phrase "*external, ecclesiastical holiness.*" The expression does not imply intrinsic character, but asserts an outward relation, "according to outward name,"

2. They all use the expressions "enter into the kingdom of heaven," "in the covenant of God," not with direct reference to the question of the *Church* connection of the children of believers, but the question of their *inward, spiritual regeneration* prior to baptism. We must not confound the antithesis plainly in their minds in writing. "Entered into the kingdom of God," answered to the term "regenerated," but asserted nothing directly as to the child's status as within or without the *Church.* This is evident from the way they constantly use the expressions. Any attempt to interpret our dogmaticians so as to extend the meaning of these terms into a denial of the relation of the children as within the Church, must have its sole plausibility in a confounding of the distinction, always asserted by them, concerning the Church as *visible* and *invisible.*

3. Only two—Calovius and Hollaz—expressly say that the children of believers are *not* "members of the Church" before baptism. And Hollaz, even while saying this, himself makes the assertion now objected to, "they have been born within the limits of the Church."

4. All the rest, in some way, either expressly concede to such children a place *in* the Church, or so treat their relation as not to deny it. *Gerhard* and *Quenstedt*, who rank among the highest authorities, as emphatically as if they had meant to put themselves, in advance, on record against the doctrine that "until the child be baptized it is in no sense within the Church," repeatedly declare that the children of believers are "*born within the Church*," "*born in the bosom of the Church*," and put this in clear antithesis to the position or relation of those "born *without* the Church." *Gerhard habitually* uses this expression as the designation of the birth-status of such children. *Baier* approvingly quotes the phrase from him.

Quenstedt speaks of them also as "children of the covenant," and includes them among the proper subjects of baptism as "members of the Church," (*cives ecclessiæ*). The selection and use of this term, "citizen," drawn from the civil constitution and expressing the status of the offspring in a nation's population, strongly sets forth the law of the position of the children of the Church. The "*Civitas Dei*," like a state, includes its own children. They belong to it. Their status is fundamentally or in provisional stage, determined by their birth as "children of the covenant." No more than a nation's infant population are without nationally, are they put outside of the organic constitution of the Church, considered in its *visible* form. The child of Jewish parents, left uncircumcised, was "*cut off*" from his people viewed as the Church, which could occur only on the basis of a relation already at least incipiently established. We have no reason to believe that the New Testament dispensation, which is an unfolding and enlargement of divine grace, reduces and abridges the covenant privileges or status of the children of the Church. If they were in the Church, so that that they could be cut off, by the old, they must in "some sense" be in it in the new dispensation.

5. That the interpretation, given by our theologians, of the "*holiness*" of 1 Cor. 7 : 14, as "*ecclesiastical*," amounts in its real force, to teaching that such children belong to the visible Church, so impliedly admitted by Dr. Krauth, in his rejection of this interpretation.* Dr. Krauth very positively denies "that children are members of the visible Church by their birth." But this gives the greater force to his explanation of the meaning of the term *ecclesiastical* applied to the sanctity of children in 1 Cor. 7 : 14. His view includes the following points: 1. "This sanctification is not a MORAL one." 2. "It is not an ECCLESIASTICAL one. The pagan wife is not a member of the Church because her husband is a Christian, neither then is her child holy, ecclesiastically separated to the Christian Church, because its father is a Christian." 3. "It

* "Conservative Reformation," p. 426.

necessarily follows then that the sanctification, being neither moral nor ecclesiastical, is GENERIC." This "generic" sanctification, he makes to mean that "the child is a member of Christendom, not of Pagandom." "The child is so far constructively in Christendom as if both parents were Christians." The point to be noted is, not the utterly unsatisfactory character of this exegesis of 1 Cor. 7 : 14, but the fact that in Dr. Krauth's mind the term "ecclesiastical," in this connection, means that the child is "a member of the Church," "separated to the Christian Church." He makes this unmistakable, by adding: "The Church is sanctified, or holy, as separate from the nominally Christian world; this is an *ecclesiastical* holiness. But with this Church there is yet a further separation of genuine Christians from merely nominal ones, and this HOLINESS is MORAL. The answer of the apostle is, not that the children (adult as well as infant) are MORALLY holy, nor that they are ECCLESIASTICALLY holy, but that they are GENERICALLY holy." This assumes that to speak of them as "ecclesiastically" holy, is to put them "within the Church," and "separate from the nominally Christian world," in the merely "generic" sense. We are fully justified, therefore, in understanding our dogmaticians who define this holiness to be "ecclesiastical," as teaching that the children are born, not only within Christendom, but within the Church and to constructive, inchoate membership. It becomes plain that Dr. Krauth thus denies that the children of believers belong to the Church, only by denying what our theologians admit and teach. He is in direct contradiction to them. He denies that the holiness is "ecclesiastical." They assert it—Gerhard, Quenstedt, Hollaz, Buddeus. Evidently, in Dr. Krauth's mind, to admit this is to admit membership in the sense in which he now denies it.

6. It is of force to remember, too, that this inclusion in the covenant and birth within the Church, is, by our theologians, made the basis for some "*extraordinary*" grace or way of regeneration, in case of death before baptism. They carefully distinguish, in this respect, between "children born in the Church', and those "born without." This makes their

inclusion in the Church on earth count more than zero even without baptism. It assumes the unity of the Church on earth and in heaven; and in default of the sacrament in the Church on earth considers the relation still divinely made effective for the heavenly state through the operation of "extraordinary" grace. It takes their inclusion "in the Church" as so real, that God will see to it that the spiritual change meant by the ecclesiastical place He has given them shall not fail, when, by no fault of the children, the ordinary means cannot be applied.

The point of doctrine concerning which we have, in this article, been seeking the view of the earlier Lutheran dogmaticians, may to some minds and at first blush appear to be of little or no consequence, and not worth the attention here asked for it. But when closely examined in its bearings, it is seen to involve relations of grave theological and practical importance. It involves the whole question of organic Christianity, including the exceedingly important point whether the Church has a legitimate right to look upon the offspring of its own membership as truly its own, or whether despite the covenant: "I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed," each new generation is compelled to lapse to a status in which instead of being in the "bosom of the Church" and under the divinely appointed means for their renewal and salvation, they are placed wholly without, thrown back into identity of position with the *world*, for subsequent recovery. Under the Old Testament dispensation, the covenant of the Church was also a family covenant, identifying the household with the Church. In the New Testament dispensation of this same "everlasting covenant," the apostolic teaching and practice took the family together, and, in organic Christianity, gave the children the same status with their parents. The individualizing and atomizing tendency of our day tends to disintegrate and destroy all organic constitutions. It refuses to recognize that God may harmonize and unify the action of His two great institutions, the family and the Church. In the swing of the times to extreme individualism the Baptists practically annul the force of the covenant, treat the children

as without, and refuse to baptize them. Their teaching and example have affected public sentiment. God's plan for the nurture of the little ones of His Church, within the Church, is lost sight of to a very disastrous degree. The teaching from which we are here dissenting, and which, we believe, does not express the best development of Lutheran doctrine, goes far in the same direction. It throws every infant outside, either with or without an open way of immediate entrance. To say that "until the child be baptized it is in *no sense* within the Church," or that it is only "in Christendom," which is certainly the common status of *all* children born in a Christian country, whether of believing parents or not, is to surrender much to Baptist thinking and leave but little force or constitutive power to the divine covenant. This excessive individualism and making of the covenant to be of such minimum effect or no effect at all, greatly tends to weaken, in the minds of the young, the sense of the divine reality of their Church connection, and to loosen the bond that holds them to it. The effect is sadly blighting. Scores on scores of the children of the Church are thus everywhere scattered in the world, many of them never recovered from their wanderings. The Church, failing thus to keep its own, spending so much of its energies to recover its own children whom it has itself helped to identify with the world, misses the true law and line of its growth and victory in the world.

ARTICLE II.

THE MESSIANIC IDEA IN PRE-CHRISTIAN APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

By Rev. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, A. M., Ph. D., Martin's Ferry, Ohio.

That peculiar class of literary productions known as apocalyptic writings owe their existence to the spirit of Judaism and to the course of Jewish history. In the usual acceptation of the word they designate a certain class of the so-called apocrypha, and, like this latter word apocalytic was not originally and etymologically used in the sense *ad malam partem* now generally received. *Ἀπόκρυφον* was used as the opposite of *ἀναγιγνωσκόμενον*, *i.e.*, read openly in the church, and consequently designated a book whose use was restricted to private circles, or whose origin and contents were hidden. Consequently too a work could be an apocryphon and authentic at the same time, and Epiphanius does in our place call the apocalypse of John an apocryphon, without thereby calling into question its apostolic origin and authority. The class of these apocrypha called apocalyptic embraces those whose contents prohibited their acceptance even to that degree which the apocrypha enjoyed. They are all of a peculiar mysterious character. Their most striking feature is the enigmatical form of presentation; everything is put forth in symbolical figurative language; persons are represented as animals, their different attitudes towards God and His laws by tameness or rapacity; events by phenomena of nature. Everything is avoided that could give a positive clue as to author, time, or events referred to, especially those just then transpiring, so that only those who were initiated in the spirit of the authors and their co-religionists could understand the references and object of the works. The peculiar hiding of names and dates is the cause of the difficulty of understanding and placing their productions chronologically. The contents embrace a series of succinct revelations, and thus dif-

fer from the prophecies of the Old Testament, which are often unchronologically arranged. They generally owe their existence to some calamity that had befallen the children of God, and are thus not to be ascribed to a mere curiosity or to a desire of reveling in the supernatural. They nearly all are apologetic of God's dealing with Israel and are filled with exhortations to remain faithful to Jehovah. The Jews knew that they were the chosen people of God, and that God had promised, at least, all the glories of this world to the faithful. But the reality seemed to smite the promise in the face; during the Syrian and Roman period just the faithful, the chasidim, had to suffer most, and therefore began to doubt the promises given of old. To uphold these, to vindicate the justice of God, and to announce the speedy arrival of help is the object which apocalyptic writers pursue, often with the fire of the ancient prophets. In exalted terms the pseudo prophets predict a terrible vengeance on the unjust and sinners, their destruction by the faithful in the period of the sword, and after their removal, the great period of peace, when finally the just shall obtain their long desired rule, and from Jerusalem, as the centre of the new kingdom, shall govern all the nations. Out of the troubles of this world the writers direct their suffering faithful to the world which is to come, to the messianic period. The prediction of this speedy deliverance and the inauguration of the messianic rule thus form the main substance of apocalyptic literature. Not that these topics alone are discussed, others too are considered, but only as relatively unimportant. Thus *e. g.* the book of Enoch discusses the laws of nature, their divine origin and government, the apocalypse of Baruch and 4 Ezra the doctrine of original sin. But notwithstanding this, they all, without exception, lay the main stress on the new king, or the new kingdom, or on both.

To give authority to these *piae fraudes* they are put into the mouth of the old heroes of faith and are usually sent into the world as productions of these fathers. We thus have the book of Enoch, the assumptio Mosis, ascensio Isaiae, apocalypse of Baruch, 4 Ezra.

These works, especially those that were written before the time of Christ's death and the foundation of the Christian Church, are of great interest, if not of importance. That the expectation of a Messiah was not dead in Israel at the time of the Saviour's appearance needs no demonstration as the New Testament shows, but that the Messiah as the Jewish mind pictured and expected him at that time was not the Messiah of the prophets nor the one who really appeared is equally true. That the people of God passing through so many political and religious trials, between the close of the O. T. canon and the birth of Christ, with their renewed zeal for the study of Moses and the prophets revived by Ezra, constantly had their minds centered on the promises given to the fathers and so enthusiastically uttered by the prophets, is but natural. Had this period been one of peace and prosperity it might have been possible, as some without foundation claim was really the case, that the messianic expectations should die; but outward persecutions tended only to drive the people nearer to their God and to find their consolation in the glories in store for those who remained faithful. Historical facts harmonize with these natural expectations. From the time of the last book of the Canon, Malachi (for critics have not yet proved that Daniel is not authentic) to the time of Christ, there is a chain of evidences in apocalyptic literature that the hopes of a Messiah or a messianic kingdom was alive in Israel, and the constant consolation of the faithful in their afflictions. The bliss of the world to come (הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא) was to them an ample recompense for their sufferings in this (הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה). A new interest is added to the examination of the phrases of the messianic idea laid down in the ante-Christian portion of the literature by the light it sheds on the peculiar shape in which this idea appears in the minds of the cotemporaries of Christ, and their objections to His personal mission, as also by the fact that it shows the true source of the Chiliasm which certain of the Church fathers sucked through the straw of Jewish Christianity—and now flourishes under the

name of Premillenarianism, a doctrine which the Confessio Augustana, Art. xvii., properly calls *opiniones judaicæ.*

The literature on this subject is rather large, but mostly inaccessible except to the specialist. It has always been a matter of great interest to the theologians of Germany to follow the developments of the Messianic idea among the Jews, and hence their literature on the subject is by far the richest. Especially can this be said of it since the discovery and examination of a number of important specimens of this class of literature under consideration in the last century. Only lately have the scholars of other European countries become interested in this topic and given good specimens of their scholarship, *e, g.*, Tiedeman in Holland, Vernes and Colani in France, Castelli in Italy. For English readers the best work is: Drummond, the Jewish Messiah, London, 1877, and on the Sibylline books may be consulted the popular and interesting article in the *Edinburgh Review*, No. 299, July, 1877.

In the brief discussion that now follows, we have adopted as far as possible, the chronological order.

The groundwork of the book of Enoch.—The prophecy, purporting to come from Enoch, the seventh from Adam, found in Jude v. 14, was known to nearly all the Church fathers down to Augustine, as taken from a certain book or books of the prophet Enoch. The fathers made considerable use of the book and evidently considered it of high authority, only one however, Tertullian, regarding it as inspired. Lost about the seventh Century, it was discovered about a century ago in an Ethiophic translation and since then has been examined by good authorities. In English we have only the poor translation of Laurence, made 50 years ago, and as that is entirely unreliable, we must refer to the Ethiopic and translate that. Although there is by no means anything like an agreement among scholars as to the composition of this book—which by the way is about as long as Genesis and is divided into 108 chapters of unequal length—but all with the single exception of the prejudiced Philippi are agreed that the book is not the work of one man, but a composition of several ele-

ments, written at different times. The best authorities too are agreed that Chaps. 1–36 and 72–105 are the earliest portion and groundwork of the whole. Without reason some have again divided this portion between two authors, ascribing chaps. 1–36 to one, and 72–105 to another, but the inner harmony is complete throughout, even in such particulars as the claim that there are two plans of punishment, in the angelology, demonology and the names of God, that we can have no hesitancy in ascribing all these chapters to one and the same author. Internal evidences alone can give us a clue as to the time of composition. In chapters 89 and 90 the author gives a symbolical account of the history of man from the creation of Adam to the Messianic period. Men appear as animals, and nations as herds. Israel and other God-fearing people as tame, the oppressors of Isreal as wild animals. The account, following close by the O. T. record, is easily understood down to the time of captivity. At that time the author says God gave His sheep, *i. e.* the Israelites, into the hands of seventy shepherds, who each should slay a certain number of the sheep and should rule to the coming of the Messiah. The majority of critics claim that these shepherds are heathen rulers who oppressed Israel, the time of the captivity, while others, with better reasons, see in them certain angels into whose hands the author pictured God as having intrusted the welfare of Israel for a certain period, to punish the renegades and lead them back to Jehovah. For the determination of the age of the book it matters not which interpretation is received. These 70 shepherds rule in periods of 12, 23, 23, 12 shepherds. The context shows that the first 12 occupy the period of the captivity, the 23 to the time of Alexander the Great, the second 23 to the tyrant Antiochus IV. Epiphanius, 175–164 B. C., and with him begins the rule of the last 12 shepherds. In c. 90, 8 sqq., the period is described as follows: "And I looked until horns grew on those lambs (the Chasidim, or law abiding Jews, or probably better, the Maccabean heroes and their adherents) and the crows (the Syrians) threw down their horns; and I saw till *one* great horn came forth, one of those sheep (the Israelites),

and all their eyes were opened. And it looked at them, and their eyes were opened, and it cried to the sheep, and the rams (the chiefs of the Maccabean insurrection) saw it and ran to it. And during all that time, those eagles and vultures and crows and buzzards (*i. e.*, the enemies of Israel) continued to tear up the sheep, and flew down on them and devoured them. * * And those crows fought with it and tried to remove that horn, but could do nothing against it." After this the author goes into the future and prophesies the destruction of the enemies of the great horn. The present for him, and consequently the time of writing, was the period of the struggle between the great horn and its enemies. Who is the horn? We naturally expect to see it in Judas Maccabee the great hero of post-canonical biblical history. But as the period of the last 12 shepherds begins with 175 B. C., it is generally thought that this period could not have been closed with Judas, who was slain in 160 B. C., and investigators have generally seen in John Hyrkanus, 135—105 B. C., this horn. But if we remember that the author does not regard the last period closed with the coming of the great horn, but pictures the last 12 shepherds as ruling to the coming of the Messiah after fierce struggles with that horn, there is no reason for not considering Judas as the great hero. Add to this, that this portion of Enoch portrays the pious as being under the political and religious rule of heathen, and the opinion reaches a certainity, as it is a well-known fact that under John Hyrkanus, himself a pious man, that very class which Enoch says was oppressed by the sinners, was the ruling class in in Israel. It can be then very readily be received, that the book of Enoch is a monument of that very memorable strife in Israel, which commenced about 165 B. C., in which the faithful were terribly wronged and oppressed not only by the heathen rulers of Syria, but also by the renegades in their own midst. With this historical basis the author's brief picture of the person of the Messiah is understood. What Israel, in this time of political and religious oppression needed most was a powerful king, a mighty ruler, who should overcome and subdue the godless forces. This desire gave the

author the outline for the personality of the expected one. In 90, 37 he is described in these words: "And I saw till a white bull was born, with great horns, and all the animals of the field and all the birds of heaven feared him and petitioned him at all times, and I saw till all their generations were changed and became white bulls, and the first among them became a great animal, and had great and black horns on his head, and the Lord of the sheep rejoiced over them and over all the bulls." The white bull is the Messiah, being born a bull while the rest are still sheep, indicates him as a being of superior strength, as does also the growth of his horns. He, as well as his adherents, are capable of development, but only in regard to power. Here then we have an earthly prince who shall rule the earthly Israel and subdue the surrounding nations. The Messiah here is nothing but a superior man. In chap. 105 he is called the son of God, but evidently in the same sense in which the children of Israel are often called the children of God in the O. T. He is the child of God *κατ' ἐξοχην*.

Although the person of Messiah, as is shown by the fact that he does not appear until after the establishment of the new kingdom by God Himself, is rather of a secondary importance to the pseudo-prophet, the messianic kingdom itself and its glories are everywhere pictured in the most glowing terms. It is commenced by the so-called period of the sword, a well known characteristic feature of nearly all apocalyptic writings, the period when, sword in hand, the just shall take ample and terrible vengeance on their former unjust oppressors. Our author, with the terrors of Epihanius' oppressions before his eye, seems to delight in painting that time of bloodshed. In c. 100 he remarks that in that period fathers will be killed with their sons at one place, and brothers will fall in death together, until blood flows in streams. And v. 3 he adds, that the horse will wade through the blood of the sinners up to its breast, and the wagon sink in to its hight. The sinners will then be removed to the valley of Gehenna, where their sufferings will be seen and enjoyed by the just in Jerusalem, the new kingdom will be established in

glory. The features of this kingdom are all of a carnal Jewish kind. Possession of the earth, the subduing of the enemies, the enjoyment of all the good of the earth, long life and many children will be the blessings then possessed. Chap. 10 : 18 sqq. thus describes this future: In those days the whole earth will be built in righteousness, and will be all planted with trees, and will be full of blessings. All the trees of pleasure will be planted thereon, and vines will be planted thereon; but the vine planted then will bring fruit in abundance, and of the seed sowed thereon, one measure will bear ten thousand, and one measure of olives will give ten presses of oil. * * And the earth will be clean of all destruction and of all sin and of all punishment and of all troubles." These are the promises and visions the author holds out to his suffering co-religionists; it is a kind of a Maccabean manifesto to remain faithful even if they did suffer, for God would soon redeem His promises and inaugurate for them a most glorious kingdom of power, when they will be able to revel in the enjoyment or all the goods of the earth. The messianic kingdom is for the author the establishment of the ideal Israel, where the law of Israel's God is observed by all, and all others must come and do homage to the chosen children of God. As before stated, the Messiah himself does not establish this kingdom, nor shall he overthrow the enemies just then oppressing Israel. He is developed and grows out of the new kingdom, and shall be *primus inter pares*. He is a being of the same kind as the rest, and appears more like a figure-head than a guiding spirit. In this respect the author is the exact opposite of the author of the *Psalterium Salamonis*, where all the stress is laid on the new king. It is quite possible that the great number of Israel's enemies during that famous insurrection under Judas convinced the author that a single person could not realize Israel's hope, that a direct interference and assistance of God was necessary. Consequently (90 : 16 sqq.) he prophesies such an interference, and states that God Himself destroys the enemies and establishes the new order of things. As the main

feature of the change is thus effected by God, the Messiah, or ruler of the new kingdom, becomes of less importance.

II. *The Sibylline Books.*—These books, together twelve, embracing in Friedlieb's edition 114 pages of Greek text, each containing 40 lines written in homeric hexameters, are full of references to the Messiah and the messianic period, and paint in glowing terms the glories soon expected. It is unfortunate that early Christian writers have so interpolated the Jewish portions of the Sibylla that in many places it is simply impossible to decide whence the sentiments come. It will therefore be necessary to omit all those portions of messianic prophecies which are of doubtful origin, and consider only those which are admitted by eminent scholars to have emanated from Jewish sources in Alexandria, before the birth of Christ. It is pretty generally conceded that Book III., by far the most interesting in the whole collection, is in the main an Alexandrian production, either of the Maccabean period, about 160 B. C. (Bleek and others), or that it originated about 140 B. C. (Hilgenfeld, Schürer, and others). In this third Sibylla, the whole passage from line 652 to line 794, is messianic, a summary of whose contents now follows. The same Sibylla prophesies that God will then send a king from the East (*ἀπ' ἡελίοιο*) who will put an end to wars on the whole earth, who will destroy certain ones but keep his promises to others. But this he will not do from his own will, but according to the command of the great God. The people of God will then be loaded with riches, with gold and silver; the earth and sea will send forth their wealth. On seeing this the kings of the earth will assemble against him and his country, but only to their own destruction. They desire to destroy the house of the great God (*i. e.*, temple at Jerusalem) and the faithful, they offer sacrifices to false gods around the city. While engaged thus the mighty voice of God will speak to them, and all will be destroyed by the hand of the Everlasting. Fiery swords fall from heaven, burning torches appear, and the earth and the sea are disturbed by the hand of the Almighty, and the Erebus, the dark, will appear. The spirits in the rocks will be filled with

dead bodies, blood will flow from the rocks, and all the powerful enemies of the new kingdom will fall to the ground, because they did not acknowledge the law. God will judge them by fire and the sword and great waters. Brimstone will fall from heaven, and hail will descend, and death destroy also all quadrupeds. Then first will the ungodly begin to know the everlasting God, and will lament exceedingly. They will then bathe themselves in blood and the earth will drink in the blood of the slain. After the removal of the wicked by the judgment of the sword, the reign of peace for the children of God commences (l. 702 sqq.). They will all assemble around the temple of God in peace, thankful for their lot to the just judge. There will then be no war for the Everlasting is their aid. The islands of the ocean (*i. e.*, the heathen nations) will then say: how much God has loved His people, and they (*i. e.*, the heathen nations) will admonish each other, saying: Up! let us all fall down on the earth and worship the Everlasting King, God, the Most High and Great. Let us send to the temple, let us all consider the law of the most-high God. For it is best for all to fall down and worship. But we had departed from the ways of the Everlasting and honored the works of our hand. After an interruption, addressing a threat to Greece, the author continues, 743, that the earth will then yield abundantly of all kinds of fruit and all species of animals will be plenty, fountains will flow with milk and the cities will be filled with good things. There will be no war, no cry of war, nor will there be a time when the earth lacks water. Then too all the kings will be friends, and the everlasting God will govern all mankind according to *one* law. He will then establish an everlasting kingdom (*βασιλήϊον εἰς αἰῶνας*) for *all* men, and all men will become godfearing, and will bring presents and frankincense to the house of God; it will be the only house in which worship will be held and all mortals will call it the temple of God (*νηὸν*, not *υἱὸν θεοῖο*). The prophets will then lay aside the sword, for they are just kings, and judges. God will dwell on Zion, and there will be universal peace.

The expectations of the Sibylla are more cosmopolitic than those of other apocalyptic writers, a peculiarity easily explained by the Alexandrian origin. The main stress lies on the estalishment of one universal kingdom of God based on obedience to the law. The vividness in the description of the terrible vengeance to come over the unjust was evidently dictated by the tortures of the Maccabean period, and like the ground-work of the book of Enoch, also a work of that period, the hope for relief is based on the direct and immediate assistance of God, and not through the instrumentality of the Messiah. This person, although mentioned in the beginning of the prophecy, takes no part in the extermination of the sinners, but is evidently conceived as the ruler of the kingdom after its establishment by God Himself.

Another portion, but a younger one, of the same book is interesting for us. It is III., 36–92. The contents clearly show that it was occasioned by the joint tyranny of Anthony and Cleopatra in Egypt. At that time the prophetess expected the commencement of the messianic period, and speaks, v. 46–50, as follows: "And then when Rome will govern Egypt also, and rule with it, then the greatest of kingdoms, that of the everlasting King, will appear on the earth. And a holy king (*ἁγίὸς ἄναξ*) will appear who will govern all the lands for all time as the times pass." With the aid of the older prophecy this brief one is easily understood. The everlasting king is undoubtedly God Himself, who will establish the kingdom, while the holy king who will govern it is the Messiah, the deputy of God.

There are a great many other prophecies in the Sibylline books of a messianic character, but they are all either of undoubted Christian origin, or their Jewish character is still a matter under discussion so that they cannot be cited and used here. It should be noticed that in this oldest erythrean Sibylla a personal Messiah, as well as a messianic kingdom, is clearly predicted.

III. *Psalterium Salamonis.* This collection of 18 psalms of unequal length, known as the *Ψαλμοὶ Σαλομώνιος*, has the two peculiar interesting features in early Jewish apocalyptic

literature of being the only production of a purely lyrical character, and in being preserved in the Greek alone. That these hymns are not a production of Solomon, is evident from their character, and is in fact not claimed by them, the name of Solomon not being found in any of them, but is only the heading prefixed to the whole collection, probably by some later editor on the basis of 1 Kings 4 : 32. Although first published in 1626, and possessing a high literary and religious character, they are at the present day not yet well known and have not been examined as critically as other works of a similar character discovered at a later date. Internal evidence points conclusively to the time immediately after the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey as the period of their origin. The psalms, in spirit, style and authorship are one, and composed and arranged with a certain system, as is already seen by the fact that the messianic passages are all in the last hymns, after the basis for the hope of a messianic kingdom has been expressed in the preceding, portrays the holy city of Jerusalem as trodden under foot by a foreign sovereign. Israel had been governed by unrighteous rulers who meet the conqueror with the words: "Thy path is longed for, come hither, enter in peace," and the stranger entered like a father into the house of his children (viii. 15–20). He enters and destroys the walls with the battering-ram (viii. 21, ii. 1), the city is full of heathen who even ascend the altar of God (ii. 2), the noblest men of Israel were destroyed and the blood of the inhabitants of Jerusalem flowed like the water of uncleanness (viii. 23), and then (xii. 13, 14) fully identify the oppressor by stating that he took captive the young men, the women and the children, and took them *to the west* (ἕως ἐπὶ δυσμῶν), and the dragon who had conquered Jerusalem is slain near the mountains of Egypt on the ocean, and "none there was who buried him," (ii. 29–31). These features, especially the last two, show conclusively that the author meant Pompey and wrote after his ignominious death, 48 B. C. At least psalm ii. was then written, but whether the others were composed immediately after the capture of Jerusalem in 63

B. C., or at the same time with the second, must remain undecided. For the former idea speaks the lack of fiery threats for his future, for the latter the vividness of the author's description of the great calamity. Time and place of composition (Palestine, for the author counts himself among those who suffered) lead us to suppose that the collection was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, a supposition that becomes a certainty, when we notice the immense number of undoubted Hebraisms found throughout the work. It would be a comparatively easy matter to retranslate it into Hebrew. Its literary character is closely allied to that of the psalms of the Old Testament. The *parallelismus membrorum*, employed throughout, is in striking contrast to the Homeric metre employed in the Alexandrian Sibylla. The spirit that pervades the book is that of a pharisaical Judaism. The calamity that has befallen the people of God is a righteous one, brought about by the sins of the people. The author is very anxious to state that God was entirely justified in permitting the dragon to take the holy city, the *ἁραρτίαι* and the *ἀνομίαι* of the people, the corruption in high and in low places have caused the heavy hand of God to be laid on Jerusalem. But the righteousness to which the author now exhorts his people is the *δικαιοσύνη προσταγμάτων*, a righteousness of works (xiv. 1). Man has the choice between good and evil; in ix. 7 he says: *τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἐν εκλογῇ καὶ ἐξουσίᾳ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν*, and his doctrine of justification is best expressed in ix. 9: *ὁ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνεν θησαυρίζει ζωὴν ἑαυτῷ παρὰ κυρίῳ, καὶ ὁ ποιῶν ἄδικα αὐτὸς αἴτιος τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν ἀπωλείᾳ*. From the historical and religious basis the messianic expectations of the psalms are easily understood. Over against the misrule of the later Maccabean princes and the oppression of Roman tyrants, the writer remembers the promises given by God to the prophets of old, and the miserable political condition of the chosen people prompts him to picture in glowing terms the grandeur of the messianic future, when a repetition of such oppressions will be an impossibility. In psalms xvii. and xviii. these hopes are vividly

expressed, and as all the later troubles were occasioned by the sadduceically inclined Asmoneans and Roman rulers, the main stress is laid on the future messianic ruler, whose government will be the exact opposite of these wicked times. The author laments the destruction of David's kingdom and of his house, of the true royal line that indicated prosperity for Israel. He therefore calls upon the Lord (xvii. 23 sqq.) to raise up the son of David, the king of Israel, at the proper time, and let him have power over the unjust rulers and cleanse Jerusalem of the heathen walking in impiety. This is to be done "in wisdom and in righteousness." After the removal of these unclean elements, the new king will proceed to the establishment of his rule. The nations that disregard the law will have fled from before his face or will be slain by the word of his mouth, and he will then gather the holy people (v. 28 sqq.) and will judge the tribes of the holy people, and will not permit unrighteousness (ἀδικίαν) to dwell in their midst. He will know them all as children of their God and will divide the land among the different tribes. In v. 31, the author, who undoubtedly ascribes all the wickedness in Israel to the influence and example of strangers, adds that in this new kingdom of glory no stranger (πάροικος καὶ ἀλλογενής) will dwell among the chosen. The establishment of this new powerful messianic kingdom will fill the heathen with fear. They will come (v. 32 sqq.) to serve under his yoke and glorify the name of the Lord, and bring as offerings to the Lord the weakened children of Israel, *i. e.* those in exile and in the Diaspora, to see the glory of the Lord, and he (*i. e.* the Messiah) will be for them a just king, taught by God. This last sentiment was probably dictated by the unjust and ungodly character of those who then ruled. According to O. T. ideas the rulers were the representatives of God on earth, destined to forward and advance the plans of God. The Asmoneans were the exact opposite of this ideal royalty, but the royal Messiah will be its personification. In v. 36 sqq. the moral aspect of the kingdom is a time when there will be no injustice, and all will be holy,

and the king will be the anointed of the Lord.* His spiritual and godly character is shown by the fact that he does not put his trust in horses and riders and instruments of war, nor does he lay up treasuries of gold and silver for battles, for the Lord himself is king. This latter statement is certainly no identification of the Messiah and God, but only lays stress on the fact that this king is a deputy of God, acting in strict accordance with His will. Above and over the messianic king still stands the King of all, God. The parables in the book of Enoch portray the Messiah in the same relations to the Lord. The nations recognize the divine mission of the new king and stand before him in fear, and he strikes the earth with the word of his mouth forever, *i. e.* his supremacy shall be eternal. The Messiah himself (v. 41 sqq.) is free from sin, and will rule a great people, and will not become weak, for God strengthens him through the holy spirit, and he has wisdom to govern in power and righteousness. The reason of this is that he puts his trust in God (v. 44), and being himself thoroughly theocratic he will lead them all in holiness, and there will be no haughtiness amongst them. Such is the beauty of this king of Israel (v. 47 sqq.), whom God has raised to rule and educate the house of Israel, and therefore all who see that day must be considered happy. The psalm closes (v. 51) with the petition: "God hasten His mercy over Israel, and deliver us from the uncleanness of the impious heathen. The Lord Himself is our king to all eternity." The last psalm, the xviii., is a beautiful prayer that God may hasten his mercy and raise up His Anointed and inaugurate the long expected kingdom of His Anointed.

It is seen at a glance that these expectations are all of a carnal Jewish type. Everywhere Israel is the exclusive partaker of God's mercies. They are "the first and only begotten children of God (xviii. 4), and Israel is the παῖδα of God (xvii. 27), their hopes are for a carnal kingdom, and the

* Not "the Anointed Lord," as the Greek Χριστὸς κύριος might seem to indicate. The original reads בְּשִׁיחַ יְהוָה, with the first word in the *Stat. Const.* Cf. xviii. 8.

other nations shall be nothing but drawers of water and hewers of stone" to the favored few. Accordingly, too, the Messiah has nothing supernatural about him; he is simply a king of the house of David, endowed with more than ordinary power to subdue the surrounding nations, and as the embodiment of pharisaical righteousness has no sin. Of course this last statement cannot be taken in the N. T. sense, for the meaning of the author was that his obedience to the law, in an outward sense at least, was to be complete. In this sense, *e. g.*, the book of Enoch too remarks that the partakers of the messianic kingdom will be sinless. Just how many in Israel entertained the views laid down in the *Psalterium Salamonis* can of course not be stated; but as it was written about half a century before Christ, was translated into Greek, and fully corresponds in spirit, doctrine and messianic hope to the then constantly increasing number of Pharisees, we may regard it as certain that it expressed the belief of many sighing under the Roman yoke at the time of Christ. With this book before us, circulated and used at the time of Christ, the objections made to Him by the Jews of His day are clearly intelligible, as well as the necessity under which He labored of repeatedly stating that His kingdom was not of this world. As the *Psal. Salam.*, more than any other apocalyptic book of that period, with the possible exception of the parables in Enoch, lays all the stress on the personality of the Messiah, and not on the character of the messianic kingdom, we can easily believe that it was one of the sources from which they drew their objections to His humility and spiritual character.

IV. *Assumptio Mosis.*—Origen (De Princip. iii. 2, 1) states that the notice in Jude 9, concerning the struggle between Michael and Satan for the body of Moses, was taken from a work called *Ascensio Mosis*, and other authorities, too, speak of the existence of such an *Ascensio* or *Assumptio Mosis*, or *ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως*. Lately only has a fragment of this work been discovered and published by Ceriani. This fragment, a Latin rendition of a Greek original, is the one Origen referred to as is evident from the opening words, and

pretends to be a series of instructions given by Moses to Joshua immediately before the death of the former. Prophetically and briefly the history of the children of Israel is portrayed down to the time of the last Asmoneans and Herod the Great, when the description becomes broader, thus giving us a hint that we have reached the age of the true author. In c. 6 he remarks: Tunc exurgent illis reges imperantes et qui sacerdotes summi Dei vocabuntur facient impietatem ab sancto sanctitatis. These are beyond all doubt the Asmoneans, as the sacerdotal and royal power had been united in Simon and Jonathan, and the two dignities then became hereditary in the family. In v. 2 he continues: Et succedet illis rex petulans, qui non erit de genere sacerdotum, homo temerarius et improbus, et judicabit illis quomodo digni erunt, v. 3, qui elidet principales eorum gladio et locis ignotis strangulabit corpora illorum ut nemo sciat ubi sint corpora illorum. * * v. 5 Tunc timor erit illius acerbus in eis in terra eorum: 6 et faciat in eis judicia, quomodo fecerunt in illis Ægypti, per xxx. et viii. annos et punibit eos. It is very plain that nobody but Herod the Great, who overcame and destroyed the Asmonean dynasty, is here meant. The decisive evidence for the time of writing is found in the next verses. 7 Et producet natos, qui succedentes sibi breviora tempora dominarent. 8 In partes eorum cohortes venient et occidentis rex potens qui expugnabit eos. The author must have written soon after the death of Herod, or he could not have said that his sons would rule *breviora tempora*, since it is an historical fact that Philip and Antipas ruled *longer* than their father. The war here referred to is that of Varus, 4 B. C. The author expects that the reign of Herod's sons will be short because the messianic period is about to come. For he continues in c. 7, ex quo (*i. e.* the Varus war) facto finientur tempora—the last times will come. A description of the expected period is given in c. 10. Then his (*i. e.* the Messiah's) kingdom will appear among all creatures, and Satan (Zabulus) will have an end; and sadness will disappear with him, and a vindication of the just will be effected. The Celestial-one will arise from the seat of His government, and

will come out of His holy dwelling-place with indignation and ire on account of His children. The earth will tremble and shake to its ends, and the high mountains will be lowered and the hills fall. The sun will give no light and be turned into darkness. The horns of the moon will break and the whole moon will be changed into blood (cf. Joel 3, 4) and the whole circuit of the stars will be disturbed. The ocean will retreat to the abyss and the fountains of water cease and rivers become dry. For the Most-High God will arise, the Eternal, and will come forward and judge the nations and destroy their idols. Then thou, O Israel, wilt be fortunate (felix), and wilt ascend on the necks and wings of eagles for thy days will be completed. And God will exalt thee and cause thee to cling to the starry heavens (haerere caelo stellarum). And thou wilt see from above thine enemies and wilt know them and rejoice and return thanks and trust thy Creator. Here, as in the other apocalypses noticed, the destruction of the enemies of the just is the first thing on the programme, and is an act effected by the immediate instrumentality of God Himself. In fact in the preserved part of the *Assumptio* there is no mention made whatever of a personal Messiah. The establishment of the messianic kingdom is the main topic for the writer. Whether we must ascribe this peculiar feature to the fact that the writer belonged to the party of the zealots, as Schürer does, or accept that a personal Messiah was mentioned in the two-thirds of the book lost, cannot be decided. There is at least one other book of a similar character, which contains no reference to the personal Messiah, although it hopes for a messianic peiord. We refer to the book of the Jubilees, or smaller Genesis, lately discovered in an Ethiopic translation. Wieseler remarks that the ideal of the author was not of a monarchical kind, but a democratic one.

The Parables in Enoch.—These embrace c. 37–71, with the exception of 51, 7—55, 2; c. 60 and 65, 1—69, 25, which form portions of the so-called Noachic additions, a series of revelations pretended to have been given to Noah and inserted later in the book of Enoch. The Parables are three in number, the first embracing c. 38–44, the second 45–57, the third

58–70, and are by far not only the most interesting portion of the book of Enoch, but of all apocalyptic literature. With the exception of a few short chapters, they all treat of the Messiah and his kingdom, the first dwelling mainly on the character of the kingdom, the second on the personality of the Messiah, the third the way it is to be established, or the judgment. On no book in this whole class of literature has there been so much discussion as on these Similitudes or Parables. There is no external evidence whatever of their existence or use before their discovery in an Ethiopic translation, a little over a hundred years ago, and internal evidences are so meagre and admit of so many various interpretations that it can be no surprise that this singular and beautiful tract should have received such varied judgments. That this whole is from one hand, written at one time, is not disputed but is conceded by all, but was it written before or after Christ, by a Jew or by a Jewish Christian? Older investigators, Dillmann, Ewald, and others, were firm in their conviction that the work emanated from a Jewish mind, while later writers, such as Hilgenfeld, Drummond, and others, are absolutely certain that it bears a Christian character. They all base their assertion on the character of the Messiah as depicted in the Parables, and this must in the end decide the question. That everything else which does not treat directly of the *personality* (and this alone) of the Messiah, is an out and out Jewish production is a certainty that cannot escape even the most superficial reader, and Drummond, recognizing this fact, seeks to rescue the Christian authorship of the messianic idea by claiming that this idea was inserted in a Jewish tract by a Christian interpolator, forgetting at the same time that were such the case, a Christian interpolator, whether heterodox or orthodox, would not have omitted all references to the historical Christ and the two great moments of his existence, His death and resurrection. It is a fact beyond dispute that all other portions of the Parables show no traces whatever of a Christian influence, and that this can be said of the messianic idea too we hope to show below. We therefore hold that the Parables were written by a Jew, in the

interest of Jewish hopes, and was not influenced by Christian literature, not even by the existence of Christianity. But just when they were written will probably never be decided. In c. 56, there is a reference to the invasion of the Medes and Parthians, but to what particular historical event the author refers, must remain uncertain; suffice it the work is ante-Christian.

The messianic idea in the Parables is the highest produced by an uninspired Jewish mind; its high spiritualized character ascends far above the somewhat crude and carnal character as exhibited by similar writers. We will try to follow the author's development. It must be important to us to discover whence the idea was taken, as this will virtually decide its Jewish or Christian character. In this regard there can be no doubt whatever. No matter how critics may decide concerning the one who was like a (not like *the*, as the authorized version reads) Son of Man, in Dan. 7 : 13, whether it is to be the personal Messiah or idealized Israel, for our author it was emphatically the former, and the picture of the Son of Man has furnished him his messianic idea. The proof for this we find in c. 46 : 1, 2: "And then I saw one who had a head of days (*i. e.* was old, the Ancient of Days), and His head was white as wool, and with Him was another whose face was like the appearance of a man; full of agreeableness was his face like that of the holy angels. And I asked one of the angels who went with me, who showed me all the secret things concerning the Son of Man, who he was and whence he was and why he came with that head of days. And he answered and said to me: This is the Son of Man who has righteousness, with whom righteousness dwells and who will reveal all the treasures of secrecy because the Lord of spirits (God) has chosen him. * * And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen will arouse the kings and the mighty from their couches and the powerful from their thrones, and will loosen the bonds of the mighty and break the teeth of the sinners."—Besides the name Son of Man, the name most frequently used in the Parables for the Mes-

siah, we find the Chosen-one, the Just-one, the Anointed, and once, c. 62 : 5, the Son of the woman. All of these can be easily understood from an Old Testament basis, and cause no difficulty when used by a man who has evidently studied that book, as our author evidently has, with the exception of the last. It has been confidently claimed that no one, without having the New Testament before him could have thought of uniting Divinity to humanity in such a manner as to call the Messiah the Son of the Woman. The objection would be valid if we had a right to find a *ὁμοουσία* or a *θεανθρωπία* in the appellation; but for this we have no right. It is a well known fact that nearly all of our New Testament words used in a higher spiritualized sense were not invented by the Apostles and Evangelists, but were taken from the thesaurus of words in the mouths and literature of the Judaism of their times, and were then raised to the dignity in which we find them in the N. T. and in Christian Theology. Deutsch, (Literary Review, p. 26) remarks: "Such terms as Redemption, Baptism, Grace, Faith, Salvation, Regeneration, Son of Man, Son of God, Kingdom of Heaven, were not, as we are apt to think, invented by Christianity, but were household words of Talmudical Judaism." Who, *e. g.*, would assert that the words *πίστις, ἔλπις, δικαιοσύνη,* so frequently used in the *Psalt. Salom.*, correspond to the N. T. ideas of faith, hope and righteousness? And when Ps. Sal. xviii. 4, Israel is called the *νἱον πρωτότοκον μονογενῆ,* no body would dream of seeing in these words of a pre-Christian author the same deep idea that is found in the New Testament in the expression "only-begotten Son of God." Think too of the words, "kingdom of heaven," so frequently found in the Mischna, not the shadow of the deep meaning in the Gospels and Epistles. We have then no right, when we find an expression sounding a little like peculiarly N. T. phraseology, to jump at once at the conclusion that the author was a Christian. In the expression "Son of the Woman," there is no more and no less expressed than in the Son of Man, and if the one is Christian the other is too, and Daniel accordingly would be a Christian writer. We indeed cannot suppose that

the author took his idea from Is. 7 : 14, as to our knowledge no Jewish exegete ever discovered the Messiah in that passage, but the expression certainly does not go any further than Mic. 5 : 2, where the birth, *i. e.* human origin, of the Messiah, and His being from everlasting, are mentioned together. And, aside from that, it is not even certain that the Greek from which the Ethiopic was translated contained this expression, as it is well known to Ethiopic scholars, and can be seen by a short comparison with the Septuagint, that the Ethiopic translators of the O. T. have frequently introduced New Testament phraseology in their version. The book of Enoch, judged by grammar and lexicon, was translated about the same time, possibly by the same men, and does in fact in some codices stand in the O. T. canon. The change in Ethiopic, from Son of Man (*beeze*) to son of a woman (*beezit*) is effected by the addition of a *t*, which the *Christian* translator or copyist could easily have added.

The most interesting feature of the description of the personal Messiah, is the pre-existence ascribed to him. In 48 : 3, the author states: "And before the sun and signs (of the Zodiac) were made, before the stars were created his (*i. e.* the Messiah's) name was called before the Lord of the spirits." v. 6 adds: "And therefore he was chosen and hidden before Him (God) before the world was created, and to eternity he will be before Him." 62 : 7 speaks in the same manner: "For previously the Son of Man was hidden, and the Most-High God preserved him before His power and revealed him to the chosen ones." Here not simply a prediction but a pre-existence is clearly expressed, yet a pre-existence not in an absolute and metaphysical sense, but in the sense of the O. T. מֵעוֹלָם *i. e.* from a period which is subjectively for the writer beyond the horizon of his personal observation or knowledge. Here again critics have been confident in their assertion of a Christian origin, strangely overlooking both the O. T. and earlier Jewish literature. In Prov. 8 : 22 sqq. the personified wisdom speaks of herself as pre-existent, in almost the very terms in which this characteristic is here ascribed to

the Messiah. Wisdom was "from everlasting," "before His works of old," "before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth." And in early Jewish writers it is quite a common thing to ascribe pre-existence to a person or even a thing whose religious importance it is desired to emphasize. Thus in the pre-Christian *Assumptio Mosis*, 1 : 14, Moses speaks of himself as *qui ab initio orbis terrarum praeparatassum*, and 1 : 17 he speaks of the people as a place, *quem fecit* (*i. e.* Deus) *ab initio creaturae orbis terrarum. Apocal. Baruchi 4*, speaks of Jerusalem as an *aedificatio—eam ostendi Adamo priusquam peccaret*, and the book of the Jubilees speaks of the Sabbath as having been kept by the angels before it was revealed to men. This peculiarity of speculative Judaism passed over into Christian literature, and accordingly we find II. Clem. 14 : 1 ; Pastor Hermae Vis. I. 1 : 6 ; Vis. II. 4 : 1, claim pre-existence for the Christian Church. (Cf. Harnock's notes on these passages). And then the development of the messianic idea in this respect is not a matter of great surprise. His existence to eternity, *a parte post*, is a prediction often expressed by the O. T. prophets; to invert this and claim an eternal existence, *a parte ante*, is a step easily made. The idea here is virtually the same as that of the "hidden Messiah" in later Jewish theology. Then too it is plainly stated in Mic. 5 : 2 that the Messiah was "from eternity," *i. e.* pre-existent, and according to Schoettgen, (*Horae Talmudicae*, p.) the Jews derived their idea of the hidden Messiah from that very passage. We see then the author of the Parables stands on O. T. ground, and on that alone. Had the historical Christ been before him, it would simply have been impossible to pass over every and each allusion to the events of His life and His doctrine. Originated from Jewish sources, and developed by a mind that was deep in the prophecies of the old covenant, the Messiah of the Parables is a Jewish not a Christian one.

The historical groundwork out of which the messianic idea of the Parables has been developed, is plainly stated. The polemics are all directed, not against sinners in general, but against a certain class of them, the kings and the powerful.

Their crime consists in departing from God's ways, and forgetting whence they had received their power. Their sin does not then consist in persecution and bloodshed, but in infidelity and reviling; he attacks the aristocratic class of renegades in Israel. The O. T. idea of theocratic kings was that they were deputies of God, called to fulfill His commands. The rulers in the days of the author were the exact opposites of this ideal theocratic royalty, they were infidels, or at best indifferentists. The author knew that under such governments Israel could never reach the promised period of peace, and therefore he announces with the enthusiasm of a prophet the speedy arrival of a king who wlll rule according to God's command. There is no statement more frequently made in the Parables than the one that the Messiah has been chosen by God Himself for the work; that he does not act of his own accord, but as God directs him; that he is not autocratic but theocratic, a deputy of God, who has all the characteristics of a god-fearing ruler, justice, mercy, righteousness—all qualities that the rulers in Israel, at the time of writing, lack. His supernatural character is emphasized in order to show the kings that he will be able to overcome and judge even such powerful persons as they are. This power and ability is a matter of great importance to the author, as seen from c. 55, where the kings behold with terror that even the wicked angels are judged by the Messiah. As in the O. T., the royal and judicial powers were united in one person, thus the new king will be first of all a judge. In this respect the description differs from those found in other books of that time, in which God Himself is depicted as judge. The judgment is a universal one, including the dead, who shall then rise. C. 51 : 1 says: "And in those days the earth will return what was entrusted to it, and Sheol will return what it has received, and hell will return what it owes." The universal character is not however absolute, but includes only those who actively or passively, as friends or foes, took part in the historical development of Israel. After the judgment, first the hitherto neutral heathen nations will take part in the newly erected kingdom. The judgment is of a strictly

forensic character; the deeds of men are weighed on scales," and they receive their reward according to their deeds—certainly an out and out Jewish doctrine. First, the wicked angels, then the wicked kings and their friends are judged and removed to an "oven of fire" which is "neither on earth nor in heaven." Then begins the full glory of the messianic rule, which is described as to its physical, moral, and spiritual character, in about the same manner in which it is done in other works of a similar nature, only that, in accordance with the more spiritual character of the writer displayed throughout the whole work, more stress is laid on the moral qualities of peace, sinlessness, *i. e.* absolute fulfillment of the Mosaic law, justice, righteousness, and the like. The centre of the government is Jerusalem, to which the other nations come and there worship God. This ideal theocratic kingdom shall last forever.

Of the other Jewish Apocalypses we cannot speak here, partly because the time of their origin is so very uncertain, (Book of Jubilees, Apocalypsis Baruchi), partly because their contents can scarcely be satisfactorily analyzed, consisting of Jewish and Christian elements (*Ascensio Isaiae*), and partly because they originated after the second descruction of Jerusalem, which event modified to a great extent the expectation of Israel (4 Ezra), or were at least modified after that event (the Targumim).

In conclusion, it should not be omitted that Philo is an important witness on the pre-Christian Messianic hopes of the Jews. In his two works, *De Exsecrationibus*, § 8–9, and *De Praemiis et Poenis*, § 15–20 his views are expressed in clear language. They do not differ much from those already expressed by other writers, only that the commencement will be made by the moral improvement of the Jews and their return from the Diaspora to Palestine. In the latter work he hopes for a personal Messiah when he says: "For a man will come forth, says the prophecy (lxx. of Num. 24 : 7), who will go out and conduct a great war, and will overcome great and powerful nations, as God Himself will assist his saints." This man of war is naturally the Messiah.

ARTICLE III.

THE CHINESE PROBLEM, OR AGNOSTICISM WORKED OUT.

By C. A. STORK, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

The practical form assumed by the religious skepticism of the day, is Agnosticism. Is there a God? has He given us a law? Shall we live after death? if we do, shall we be rewarded and punished according to our life here? To all these questions the skepticism of the times simply answers, "*ignoramus.*" It does not deny that there is a God, a future life: it only says, 'We do not know.' As one distinguished Agnostic puts it: "Questions of theology are questions of lunar politics;" there may be a reality answering to the speculation of theology, and there may be political activity in the moon; but we do and can know nothing about either. They are beyond the scope of human faculties.

Now this is a position at once more difficult to attack, and yet more hopeful, than the old ground of dogmatic Atheism. It was not hard to show the impossibility of proving a negative as to the Divine Existence. Let men analyze the Universe as they would, and show the apparent sufficiency of matter and force to account for all phenomena; let them multiply objections to the proofs of a Personal Cause and a future state; and yet there was that great realm of unexplored possibility lying behind every philosophy. Behind force and matter there might be a Personal Intelligence, the spring of everything. After all the objections to his existence, it might be that he did exist. The trouble was that between them and their conclusion, lay the deep wide gulf of human ignorance: What might not be hidden there? But now skepticism has removed that unknown region to its own side. Against every argument for the truth of Theism it entrenches itself in the dark: "we do not know;' 'the data are insufficient;' 'it may be so, but it is not proven.' And

that position can never be carried by direct argument. It will probably always remain to mere philosophy an open question.

But practically it is a more hopeful position because of what it implies. And what does it imply? It seems to me it involves this, the recognition of the vastness and mystery of the Universe. The dogmatic Atheist must always be a man singularly insensible to certain facts of life. He perceives the facts that appeal to the senses, to the hard logical understanding, but he sees nothing more. The scheme of the Universe to his mind is all clear and compact: he sees to the very bounds of it and understands it. He traces the whole structure of things, animate and inanimate, from the original atoms; and when he ends, everything is accounted for, nothing is left out. He is impatient with every one who does not see how satisfactory his explanation is. But such a state of mind can exist only with a total insensibility to whole classes of feelings and experiences that are themselves real facts to be accounted for. That, at least, is not the position of the Agnostic. He recognizes the ultimate mystery, the contradictions, the unexplained stream of tendency in human nature. He does not admit the Theistic solution of the problem; but he admits the problem. Life, he says, is a riddle; only there is no answer to it. But to see the problem, to feel the mystery and the weight of it, is hopeful. It shows that the soul is alive and sensible. The Theistic solution may not be accepted, but a solution is felt to be needed. And there is always hope where there is dissatisfaction. I think we may recognize in the new form which skepticism has taken an indication of returning sensibility to the spiritual facts of life.

But while the skepticism of the day acknowledges the mystery of the Universe to be intellectually insoluble, it proposes practically to solve it. The Universe can never be explained, says the Agnostic; well then, he goes on, we will ignore the part that is mysterious, and pay attention only to what we do know and can understand. And so he draws a line around the facts that are plain and intelligible, and all

that lies outside of that narrow circle he gives over to neglect.

The practical solution of the problem of life, then, is *secularism.* It says, "You cannot live for both worlds, because you do not know both. You know but one. Live for the one you do know." That is very plain; though like all rules of conduct, it is a good deal easier to understand it than it is to carry it out. It may be doubted whether, as long as the intellectual problem remains, the human mind will consent entirely to go on and ignore it. There is the mystery, and a mystery in the mind is like a foreign substance in the body; you cannot isolate it and enclose it in a neutral sack, and have the functions of life go on as if it were not. You may say, I will not think about it; but not thinking about it does not destroy it: it will exert its influence. The mind will be drawn to it; and after a season of practical activity it will go back to the mystery and try at its solution. Either that must happen, or the mystery must be destroyed, or lost sight of.

But leaving that; let us suppose the mind of the race to be disengaged from the question and interests that have absorbed so much of its energy since the dawn of history. Let us grant that Agnosticism is practically made the rule of life, and that secularism becomes the religion of the race: men no longer ask of God and His character, of His will and purpose, nor of the future life; but the whole energy of mind is bent to the business of living here; the horizon is narrowed to the life of the individual or, at the widest, to the prospects of the human family for the period of the earth's continuance. What then? What may we look for as the result of that transfer and concentration of human energy?

The Agnostics have their answer. They predict that the result of such a concentration of the powers of the race on the question of making the most of this life would be to ameliorate in a wonderful degree the evils of human existence. All hope of a future state once given up, and the whole man bent on making the most of this world, there

would be, they tell us, such a fund of ingenuity available for mastering the difficulties which beset human life that we might expect, if not an extinction of the miseries of earthly existence, yet such such an amelioration of them as would make life a state of extraordinary felicity. So impossible is it to extirpate that hope of the perfect state which has generally been accredited to religion as one of its barren and injurious dreams. If there is to be no heaven beyond, then men will dream of a heaven here: and so the Agnostic predicts a worldly Millennium. Taking heart by the great conquests of science and civilization over many of the manifest evils of life, he sees in the future a day when a larger knowledge and a riper civilization will relieve the race from the miseries of disease and poverty, bad government and wars, famines and accidents, and the whole train of human ills. He does not even despair of a day when, by attending carefully to the laws of good conduct and by improved education, the race will get rid of vice and crime. He believes in a kingdom of God to come, without any God of course, wherein shall dwell education and a superior knowledge, and from which all evil shall cease. It is a beautiful dream; but the Agnostic hopes that some day it shall be made real.

Take only the pictures of this condition painted by two very diverse Agnostics, leaders in their respective camps, Prof. Huxley, the prophet of salvation by science, and Mr. Matthew Arnold, the preacher of salvation by culture. Prof. Huxley describes the perfect man whom secularism, when it is finished, will bring forth,—"Who has been so trained in youth that his body is the ready servant of his will, and does with ease and pleasure all the work that, as a mechanism, it is capable of; whose intellect is a clear, cold, logic engine, with all its parts of equal strength, and in smooth working order; ready, like a steam-engine, to be turned to any kind of work, and spin the gossamers as well as forge the anchors of the mind; whose mind is stored with a knowledge of the great and fundamental truths of Nature and of the laws of her operations; one who, no stunted ascetic, is full of life and fire, but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a

vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience; who has learned to love all beauty, whether of nature or of art, to hate all vileness, and to respect all others as himself." A very admirable figure; "without God in the world," it is true; but not, according to Prof. Huxley, without hope. But that "trained body," and "trained passions," and "cold logic engine,"—is it not just all a little too suggestive of an automaton? Is there not the least creak in the world about the joints? Automata, however, I believe, is what Prof. Huxley says we all are at bottom. But such automaton figures secularism is to turn out, as a button-machine turns out buttons, each the fac-simile of its fellow, and all perfect after their kind.

Mr. Arnold has a vision of a future even loftier. He has got rid, it is true, of God by ignoring Him, and of a Future State by turning his back on it; but he still believes in a kingdom of God;—a very earthly sort of kingdom, however, if we may be allowed to say so. "The expression, the kingdom of God," he says, "does point to a transformation of this present world through the victory of what Butler calls virtue, and what the Bible calls righteousness, and what in general religious people call goodness; it does suggest such transformation as possible." This possibility, which he expounds to be the immortality Christ has brought to light in the Gospel, is to be realized by "coming to live, even here in this present world, with the higher impersonal life." And this "impersonal life," we are assured, men will reach some day by the agency of culture. This substitute for the grand vision of eternal life in the heavenly state, is a poor flat thing; but, such as it is, it is a kind of Millennium, the Millennium of culture and commonplace. Another dream!

But there is a nearer way to get at the probable effects of Agnosticism on the race than these conjectures. If we can find a people on whom the experiment of dropping out the belief in the supernatural, has been tried, we shall discover in their history what we seek. And with such a people the events of our time are bringing us into close contact.

We have been brought face to face in a very practical way

of late with the civilization of China; and the longer we study it the more baffling does it seem. Practically we do not know what to do with the Chinaman; and intellectually we find the explanation of the civilization he represents the hardest of problems. Here are a people who, before the civilization of the western world was born, had possessed themselves of some of the greatest of modern inventions, gunpowder, printing and the mariner's compass; and who when Rome was yet a rude and petty republic had organized an elaborate and powerful government. But in the midst of this advance there suddenly came a pause. For 2,500 years the fabric of Chinese society and polity has stood motionless. Since that pause the whole face of Europe has been transformed twice over: one civilization has come and gone, and a second has reached what seems its maturity; but in China not a shadow of change has intervened. Generations have come and gone, but the nation continues motionless: it is the cloud on the side of the mountain in which the particles are ceaselessly appearing and disappearing while the whole remains unaltered.

And this is not the pause that comes between advance and decline: if it were it would be the pause of a life too vast to be measured by any chronology known to history. But China is as vigorous to-day as she was 2,000 years ago. Her population display a vitality and tenacity equal to that of the youngest and strongest nations. They seem to have mastered the problem of how to get the most out of life with the smallest expenditure of material. It is this that makes them so odious to the people of California. As one has described them: "They can live and work hard in all climates; they take and lose life with absolute indifference; their armies in Central Asia advance with such deadly perseverance that they plant and reap corn after one campaign in order to prepare for the next, and they kill the males of conquered districts with the same calm with which they throw a bridge over a stream." Of all nations on the face of the earth, it must be conceded that they have best learned how to make the most of this world. They have reduced life, meaning by

that comfortable and healthy existence here, to a science. And yet they make no progress. It is this combination of energetic, persistent vitality with an utter immobility, that makes them the puzzle of history. With us vitality has always been associated with progress. It has seemed impossible that a man or a race should be strong and not advance. But here is a nation that for nearly 3,000 years has neither advanced nor receded, and is yet one of the most persistent races on the face of the earth.

There is only one feature in their history that throws any light on the problem. It is their religion. Five centuries before Christ, Confucius fixed his hold on the nation, and penetrated the popular mind with his theories of religion and of life. It has been disputed whether he was the creator of the present mental condition of the Chinese people, or only the skillful interpreter of tendencies and dispositions that were moving disconnectedly in the general mind. Be that as it may, China since his day has maintained the attitude towards the problem of life which he took. Other religions have come and gone among them; but they have touched only the surface. Confucianism has possessed the Chinese mind, colored all its habits, and given its peculiar tone.

And what is Confucianism? In brief, it is Agnosticism: it is the only practical form Agnosticism has ever taken. In fact, we should not be far out of the way if we were to describe Chinese civilization as Agnosticism worked out.

A brief description of its principal features will suffice. Confucius, who was born B. C. 551, came on the stage at a great crisis in the history of his people. "The World," says Mencius, his follower, "had fallen into decay, and right principles had disappeared. Perverse discourses and oppressive deeds were waxen rife. Ministers murdered their rulers, and sons their fathers. Confucius was frightened by what he saw,—and he undertook the work of reformation." It was the decay of a feudal civilization, a condition of things much like that of Western Europe in the 14th century. But China had this advantage, literary culture and many arts of civilzation had arrived at a high pitch of eminence. But, in spite

of great knowledge and much skill in arts, the period was one of thorough degeneracy. Into this chaos Confucius came as a reformer. He attempted to effect his work of regeneration at first through political means; he sought the rulers, hoping to influence them. But in this he was foiled. He traveled from city to city, trying first one great potentate and then another, but none would adopt his schemes of reform. "If any ruler," he once said," "would submit to me as his director for twelve months, I should accomplish something considerable; and in three years I should attain the realization of my hopes." In his 69th year he gave up the attempt to carry out his ideas by any political means, and retired into seclusion to devote his few remaining years to literary work, and the instruction of a few devoted disciples. In five years he died, his life an apparent failure. But the day of his burial was the beginning of his influence over the nation. He became at once an object of admiration; his works were studied with avidity; his ideas took hold both of the cultivated and popular mind; and from that grasp the Chinese people have never been released. Under his tuition ages ago they became a nation of Secularists, and Secularism is the system under which they have lived to this day.

He proposed that men should learn the laws of their well-being and follow them; but that well-being he restricted wholly to the present life. He considered man only in society, and that society as existing only here. And his reforms were only of a political and superficially ethical character. The highest ideal was the State; the perfection of the State was the absolute perfection, the *summum bonum;* and all his teachings were directed to securing that. His method for attaining this was very simple; it was only the regulation of manners. He collected and codified a horde of petty maxims and precepts; and these he enforced by one fundamental virtue, obedience. The first virtue was obedience to parents; the next, obedience to the powers of government; the highest stretch of perfection was devotion to the Emperor. There was, however, very little that was systematic in the teachings

of Confucius. It was no one great idea that gave him mastery over the mind of his people; but rather a practical spirit.

There are three questions, however, that test at once the spiritual character of any moral or religious system: they are these; what does it teach about God; what about a future state; what about sin? If we try Confucianism by these, it will be evident how completely Agnostic it is.

As to the teachings of Confucius about the Being of God, it is significant that it is still an open question with scholars whether he believed in a personal God at all. Arnauld and other writers broadly assert that he did not. In speaking on the subject, Confucius himself uses only the vague impersonal term, Heaven. And this stands only for a cold abstraction of the logical faculty, certainly not the personal and spiritual Being we mean by our word God. Certain it is that he had fixed his own vague and irresolute way of regarding the question on the Chinese mind; for scholars still dispute as to what word they shall use, or if indeed there be any word in the Chinese language they can use, to express the idea of God. To all inquiries as to a personal Deity and Creator he gave answers that are pure Agnosticism. "You find yourself," he says, "in the midst of a stupendous, yet most orderly piece of mechanism. That mechanism, so far as we can tell, is self-originating, self-sustaining. Change there is, but no creation: all things from eternity existed and were subject to a flux and reflux, in obedience to initial laws impressed upon them, how and why we know not, by some stern necessity. Being warned and guided by this principle: devote yourself no longer to the fruitless study of theology; it brings, and can bring with it no practical advantage. Seek not to explore the doctrine of final causes; rather, if you speculate at all, confine your thoughts to the discussion of phenomena and the laws of phenomena. Such alone are useful and legitimate subjects of inquiry. It is possible indeed that laws may be connected somehow with forms of spiritual agency; we cannot absolutely say that they are not. You may continue, therefore, on this ground to follow the established ritual of your ancestors. Sacrifice *as if* your sacrifice were a

reality; worship *shin* as if *shin* were really present. But meanwhile your chief concern is with the visible and palpable universe, and with the homely tasks of life." How familiar all this seems; but it sounds like a quotation from an article in the "*Nineteenth Century*" or the "*Fortnightly Review.*" And no wonder, the hands are the hands of Confucius, but the voice is the voice of Professor Huxley.

And what of a future state? Here, too, his teachings are thoroughly Agnostic. He refuses to derive any motives of conduct from the consideration of the life beyond. Good and evil are to be recompensed by the natural results of conduct here in time. To all inquiries about the future world he turns a cold indifference. One of his followers asked him the question, "What becomes of a man when he has passed from the stage of life?" "While you do not know life," was the reply, "what can you know of death?" He does not say that death ends all; only, "we do not know." "Perhaps this present life," he says, "may be your last, your sole possession, * * meanwhile your chief concern is with the visible and palpable universe, and with the homely tasks of life." Well, that is Agnosticism pure and unadulterated. Mr. Holyoake himself could not put it better.

With such negations in the place of God and the hope of immortality, it is easy to see what Confucius' doctrine of sin must be. Take away God, cut down the existence of the soul to the span of seventy years, and sin loses its essential character. Right and wrong are only convertible terms with order and disorder. Sin is not a consciousness unique, solitary, mysterious, a stain that strikes through to the roots of our being; it is only a natural stage in the development of the human animal. And all this is Confucianism. He denies that human nature is bad. "Human nature," says Mencius echoing his master, "is good, just as water has a tendency to flow downwards; men are universally inclined to virtue, just as water invariably flows downwards. Water, by beating may be made to splash over your head, and by forcing may be made to pass over a mountain; but who would ever say that this is the natural tendency of water?

It is because violence is applied to it. Thus men can be made vicious; but it is by no means their nature." Sin is not a fault in the man himself, but only a result of defective education. Correct his surroundings and give him healthy teaching and sin will disappear. And of course there is no place for self-condemnation or remorse. Guilt is something of which the Chinese philosopher takes no cognizance. He lives for time: he is satisfied with the results of time. Things are disordered here it is true; but it only needs patience and careful instruction, and above all the cultivation of political economy, and all wrongs will be righted, and the kingdom of heaven, such a kingdom of heaven as is realized in the China of to-day, will come on earth.

As for the cry of man for his God, Confucius does not hear it. The longing of the soul for the infinite, the aspiration towards the perfect in character, the sense of dependence, the exercise of reverence, the craving for spiritual regeneration,—all these are to him only the imagery of fantastic dreams.

In short, Confucianism is Agnosticism. Feature by feature it answers to that theory of life. In its refusal to consider the questions of theology, questions concerning God, the Future State, and the reality of sin, in its determination to address itself only to the present, the temporal, the earthly, it is the skeptical philosophy of our time.

And now we are ready for the question, What has Agnosticism made of the Chinese? It has had a fair field all to itself, and a sowing of many centuries: what kind of civilization does it produce, and what sort of kingdom of heaven does it set up?

Two features strike us immediately and forcibly in considering the civilization of China: *its tremendous vitality, and its dreary commonplaceness.*

For more than twenty centuries now the Chinese have addressed themselves to the problem of how to get the most out of life here. They have simplified their problem under the inspiration of Confucius by dropping clean out of mind all questions of a theological character, and have concentrated

every energy on the business of living here. In this they have had a great success. They have developed a civilization that clings close to its facts, to the seen, the palpable, the ponderable, the material; and these it has mastered. An acre of ground in China supports more human life, such as it is, than an acre in any other part of the world. The human animal there can do more work on a smaller amount of nourishment than any other human animal on the face of the earth. In the competition of labor the Chinamen can beat not only the Californian, but the European, the negro, the Hindu, in a word every rival.

And he is not unhappy in his pinched, narrow life. He works as hard as the peasant of Germany or the artisan of England, but he is incomparably more content with his lot. All writers unite in testifying to his cheerfulness. There is no enthusiasm wasted; but neither is there any melancholy. The problem before him has been to make the most of life here; and to do this he has learned to economize feeling. Why waste energy and time in unavailing wishes, in dreams of the far-off, the supernatural? As one of their admirers has described them, "they are a swarm of plodding utilitarians, sternly adherent to the actual and the positive: * * a matter-of-fact temperament without salient ideas or special enthusiasm makes the Chinaman push all work into infinitesimal detail." As he has stripped life of the imaginative element, and made religion to consist in a code of manners and the cultivation of political economy, there is no room left for unprofitable longings. Every energy of the soul is put to practical work; there is no expenditure of vitality in spiritual speculation and aspiration. The Chinaman has learned the art of economizing vital force; and that is an enormous saving. To this should be added another great economy which they have achieved, viz., their singular freedom from excess of nervous sensibility. It is noticed that the Chinese are more insensible to pain than other races; they suffer less from nervous irritability after injuries; they recover more quickly from surgical operations. And this is a natural result of the strict confinement of nervous activity to the uses

of things actual and material. Confucius turned the mind of the race away from all spiritual contemplations. The result is that the great waves of feeling which come and go with the exercise of spiritual speculation and emotion, cease. Development of sensibility is checked and you have a race fitted for the monotonous round of a life of hard toil. You have, too, a race specially qualified for meeting the hard, cold facts of life. It is noticed that no race gives and takes life with such indifference as the Chinese. They exterminate a conquered tribe, or lie down themselves to die by famine, with equal coolness and unconcern. For this they have been judged to be cruel; but it is not cruelty, it is only the stolidity that results from defective nervous sensibility.

What a persistent, tenacious, indefatigable race of workers has Agnosticism made of them. They have solved the problem of how to live cheap, work hard, submit stoically to death, and yet be cheerful under it all. They are a race of admirable animals. And thus far they have vindicated Agnosticism as a working theory of life. To lose sight of God, to have no thought of a future life, to drop out all sense of sin and guilt from the human consciousness, to concentrate the whole energy of the mind on the business of living here and now, certainly does make of man a powerful, tenacious, and cheerful animal. But is such an animal worth preserving? Would the kingdom of heaven come if the middle kingdom were extended over the whole earth? Will the race have reached perfection when we are all Chinese?

And this brings us to consider the other striking feature of Chinese civilization, *its commonplaceness.* Life in China is a dreary dead level of mediocrity. There are no depressions and there are no elevations. It is one flat plain of common sordid appetites, and petty desires, all of the earth earthy. There is no progress in the nation. Things are there now just as they were two thousand years ago. The national mind conceives of no possible improvement: things are just as they ought to be; the ideal has been realized; it was realized twenty centuries ago. History is only a monotonous line of coming and going emperors and dynasties. And it is

the same with the individual. The Chinese child becomes a man in capacity to work; but he never ceases to be childish. St. Paul's declaration that when he became a man he put away childish things, would illustrate nothing to the Chinese mind, for a Chinaman never puts away childish things. He flies kites, plays with toys, is consumed with infantile curiosity at the age of fifty as at five. His maturity is only a hardening of muscle and a ripening of the meaner processes of the logical faculty: character seems not to develop with manhood. There is no perspective in the Chinese mind any more than there is in their art. The blue plates, familiar to our boyish eyes, in which the man in the foreground is no bigger than his fellow a mile away across the bridge, is at once an illustration and a type of Chinese civilization: it is all an eternal here and now. They know nothing of lights or shades.

They are, as might be expected, a people devoid of humor. It would be as hard to get a joke through a Chinaman's head as Sydney Smith affirmed it was to introduce it into a Scotchman's. He is, it is true, the occasion of mirth in others, but it is *at* him we smile, not with him. No mind, for instance, with the slightest touch of humor could have written the great apostrophe to duty, with its anti-climax, which is attributed to Confucius: "You constitute one little member in some mighty organism; you stand as part of some great moral order: strive to act on all occasions as such a being should act. Far from pausing to bemoan your weakness or unworthiness, remember that he who offends against heaven has no one to whom he can pray. The past is gone and is irrevocable. Be more vigilant in time to come." This is very fine: one feels his pulse beat quicker to these grand sentiments; but now for the climax: "Endeavor so to rule yourself, according to the sacred maxims, that you may be fitted first to rule a family, and lastly may attain the highest point of your ambition,—an office under government." There is a noble end for the goal of life. It is worthy of the utterance of an Andrew Jackson or a Roscoe Conkling: "Strive to act as one who is part of a great moral order, and you

shall have—a post-office!" A congressman might say that seriously; but how could a sage? Well, he could not if he had a spark of humor. But Confucius had none; and his followers for twenty centuries have had none either.

There is no imagination among them; that is nothing of what we know as such. A thin play of fancy flutters over their literature and art, like the shimmer of light on polished metal; but for the power that builds and weaves and projects before the mind's eye its creation of character and life, with their mysteries of light and shade, of passion and aspiration, with a movement and goal,—all this is wanting to the Chinese.

And there seems to be in them no capacity for enthusiasm, except it be an enthusiasm for making money. They have a passion for trade; but religion patriotism, even the ordinary human affections, seem to kindle in them no fire. One writer says of their humanity, "it ameliorates but does not reconstruct: it has an apathetic and languid air, and does not rise to enthusiasm." Now humanity is the one virtue, according to the Agnostic, which above all others is to survive the decay of religion. If Secularism is to do anything for us it is to do away the miseries of man. But the most perfectly worked out Agnosticism the world has ever seen has lost all nerve or spirit for reforming men.

Of their religion mention has been made before. It is a horde of petty maxims about daily living, with the Emperor for its object of supreme reverence, and the cultivation of political economy for its highest exercise. Its heaven is an office under government, and the proper distribution of the post offices is its ideal of the moral order of the universe. And this is the outcome of Agnosticism!

But it will be said that the immobility and dreary commonplaceness of Chinese civilization are not the result of Agnosticism, but only an accidental quality due to natural temperament, or to some agency concealed now in their remote past.

With respect to that, two facts are to be considered.

First, The fact that at some distant period the Chinese

were possessed of a civilization progressive, highly inventive, and fertile in ideas. No one supposes that the knowledge of gunpowder, printing, and the mariner's compass, to say nothing of all the arts and elaborations of a complex social and political structure, came to them by revelation from heaven, or by inheritance from a superior race. There is the existing civilization petrified, motionless for 2000 years, but carrying in it all the marks of a former age of discovery and progress. How came this great moving tide of civilization to a standstill, to be locked up in this frost of centuries? Concede that the feudal decay of the centuries before Confucius gave a pause to the movement; so there was a pause in the civilization of Europe when western feudalism declined; but when partial order was restored progress was resumed: it was only a pause, not a petrifaction.

Then there is the other fact, that just at the moment when order began to be restored, Confucianism laid its grasp on the Chinese mind and turned it decisively away from the idea of God, the future life, sin and righteousness, in a word from the supernatural. Chinese immobility dates from the establishment of Secularism or practical Agnosticism, in the form of Confucianism, as the religion of the nation. This may be only a co-incidence; but it is the only fact that throws any light at all on this hardest of problems.

And further, it ought not to be considered an isolated fact, a mere co-incidence; for it is a fact that falls in with our natural expectations. No one will suspect M. Renan of an undue bias to theological ideas, but he says in his Studies of Religious History, that the fact that the Chinese are of all people the least supernaturalist, explains to his mind "the secret of their mediocrity." That is to say, to take from man the idea of God and immortality, is to narrow his scope. Shut him up to time; roof over the heavens above him; for his infinite substitute the indefinite: and you have not merely taken from him so much future; you have really changed the character of his present. The mystery, the greatness, the immeasurable hope of existence, all that gives to life its light on the horizon, is gone. Life becomes a measured tract,

an enclosed paddock,—so many years, such and such possibilities, all bounded and visible,—and shut in there to browse, man loses with his infinite prospect his infinite elasticity. In short, M. Renan thinks, as most of the great thinkers have thought before him, that to paralyze the religious nature, is to save the political and social animal, but to destroy the subtle, aspiring, creative soul. It was this that Tennyson meant when he wrote,

"Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay."

He was not thinking of the contentedness of the masses, the relations of labor and capital, the material aspects, of the two civilizations; in that view the Chinaman has the better of the European; as a working animal he far surpasses his European brother. But it was the spiritual life, the out-look, the hope, the aspiration of Europe, alongside of the spiritual apathy and languor of China, that pointed the comparison. It was the mountain region with its lovely valleys and lofty peaks, its rushing streams and rugged gorges, by the side of the flat levels of the lowlands.

Attention enough, it seems to me, has not been paid to this aspect of the transformation which must be effected in human nature by the suppression of its spiritual side. We have been told what vast energies of the intellect were wasted on the speculations of theology; the word *scholasticism* represents that terrible expenditure; for scholasticism was the gulf that for two centuries swallowed up the most of the mental force of Europe. We know, too, what a world of passionate hopes, what a treasure of enthusiasm, of lofty aspirations, and high dreams, was sunk in religious controversy. It is easy to deplore this, and to paint a picture of what might have been done if the scholars who spent centuries in going in doors only to come out of them again, had devoted their subtlety and persistence to the problems of real life. But who can tell us what the human mind itself will be when once the spiritual world is closed up as only waste land? You can calculate how much energy will be saved by ceasing to think barrenly about God and immortality; but can you tell how

much spiritual energy will be left in men who do not believe in God or a future life at all?

Such a condition of things would be to the mental economy what the reduction of all the earth's mountains to plains would be to the material economy. There would be more land to plough, but a great deal less of the forces that make it worth plowing. And Agnosticism is neither more nor less than an attempt to level the highlands of human nature, its solitary peaks of faith and aspiration, to the flat level of the plains. The plea is that mountains are only barren and uninhabitable places, and that once levelled they would grow so much more corn. But reduce human nature to the plain of mere existence, to the well-being of the body, and the cultivation of the trading and social faculties, and what sort of spiritual force would you have left? The answer, it seems to me, is given in the plains of China. That huge mass of four hundred millions of human beings, with no humor, no enthusiasm, no aspiration, no progress, no faith, no hope, no future, that crowd of toiling animals eager for gain, indifferent to life, dull, monotonous, commonplace, sullen, is the answer.

Mr. Matthew Arnold finds fault with Bishop Butler for making the full coming of the *Kingdom of God* to depend on the intervention of God Himself. "Butler," he says, "decides that good men cannot now unite sufficiently to bring this better society about; that it cannot, therefore, be brought about in the present known course of nature, and that it must be meant to come to pass in another world beyond the grave." Not so, says Mr. Arnold, we do not need for the kingdom of God to come, to have a future state, nor a personal God, nor any fathomless distinction between sin and righteousness. He thinks we may find an immortality in being generous and unselfish here; that we may have the aspiration and joy, the inextinguishable hope and spiritual longing that belong to the idea of God and eternity, without God or eternity. He bids us believe that when we have ceased to spend our energies in arguing about a God in whose existence we firmly believe, and take to living to a God in whose existence we

do not believe at all, that then the kingdom of God will come.

Well, Confucius persuaded the Chinese to try that experiment: "Devote yourself," he said, "no longer to the fruitless study of theology * * your chief concern is with the visible and palpable universe, and with the homely tasks of life * * be thoughtful, therefore, be industrious; make the most of what you have; be modest, sober, grave, decorous; cultivate the qualities which mark the man of the due medium * * and at last you may attain the highest point of your ambition,—an office under government." And the Chinese tried it. They gave up theology; they dropped the fairy-tale of immortality; they turned their backs on God, and gave themselves to practical things, and to culture,—to the cultivation especially of political economy, that noble science, to which Mr. Andrew White, of Cornell, so ardently urges our young men to devote themselves. They realized Professor Huxley's ideal of attending only to what they could see, and know, and verify. They followed out Mr. Arnold's gospel of seeking to establish by culture a *Kingdom of God* here. And they have it. They entered it a long time ago. The Emperor, the Son and Representative of Heaven, is their substitute for God; to become a mandarin of nine buttons is their entrance into heaven. They have mastered the problem of getting rice enough for all, of being cheerful without hope and satisfied with the commonplace. They have a *kingdom of God* of mediocrity and dreary immobility. Their New Jerusalem is a city where nothing changes, nothing happens; there are no dreams there, no future, no aspiration; nothing but rice illimitable and the prospect of getting an office under government.

Behold the kingdom of God is among them! but who would enter it?

ARTICLE IV.

REGENERATION BY BAPTISM.

By Rev. Prof. E. F. Giese, Carthage College, Ill.

Höfling, in the standard work of modern times on Baptism, arrives at the conclusion that the relation of the efficacy of the sacraments to that of the word of God, needs a more correct statement. He reaches this conclusion by his investigation into the doctrine of baptism, and declares that this doctrine is yet waiting a consistent development. This judgment is confirmed by the differences of opinion prevailing among the German theologians concerning it, as well as by the state of uncertainty about it, betrayed by our church in this country. The first Lutheran Diet gave occasion for the assertion, uttered with the air of trustworthy information, that this doctrine of baptism is a constant theme for discussion at our District Conferences; and the second Diet raised the inquiry concerning it to the dignity of being, at present, about the most important of all questions of doctrine. It appeared during its sessions, that this was one of the main obstacles to the unity of the church, as if the hope for a union of the different parts of our church rested on the development of this doctrine to a state of greater clearness and simplicity. What was wanting, did not seem to be a willingness to hear and to be taught, but rather clear and definite views of the doctrine.

If, looking for the cause of this strange lack of harmony, we turn to the acknowledged masters of Lutheran orthodoxy, the great dogmaticians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, we readily discover the origin of all the doubts and questions, and of the great variety of opinions: it is nothing but the state of the accepted doctrine itself, which has not yet gained a settled harmony and consistency in its statements, but is still waiting to be completed. It is not one of the mere accidents which does not fully harmonize with the

structure otherwise well built; it is rather the centre itself of the doctrine of baptism, which disturbs the harmony of the system. The disturber of the peace, among the members of the Lutheran Church, as well as among the different parts of the system of the Lutheran doctrine, is the question about regeneration by baptism.

A few statements, easily gathered from "Schmid's Dogmatik," or any other representative of the doctrine of our dogmaticians, will suffice to show the *defects of our doctrine* about baptism, and the necessity of a revision.

Regeneration is represented as equivalent to conversion, and the living faith of the repenting sinner, is said to be a true and proper regeneration. But this clear and plain definition does not remain unlimited; baptismal regeneration disturbs the simplicity of it, since infants must also be acknowledged as regenerated, with whose regeneration the first definition will not agree, "as children cannot properly be said to be converted," (Hollaz, Schmidt, p. 477). Therefore a second definition of regeneration had to be given, which naturally remained rather indefinite, viz., that it is some operation of the Holy Spirit in the mind of the baptized infant, which in some undefined way is like that described in adults: as Chemnitz says, (Schmid, p. 479): "Although we may not sufficiently understand, and cannot explain, what the action and operation of the Holy Spirit is in infants who are baptized, yet that it exists and is effected through the word of God, is certain."

Another incongruity is in the *locating of regeneration.* The first and most positive assertion is, that it takes place in baptism; however, this assertion is unqualified only in regard to infant baptism. In the case of adults it is less positive, or is modified by the concession that with them regeneration does not of necessity, nor always, coincide with baptism, or that regeneration precedes baptism, and baptism then only adds a confirmation or seal to it.

Saving faith, the great new doctrine of Luther, is the clearest and most unmistakable of all points of doctrine with our old dogmaticians. It is this doctrine of saving faith, which

they consider their stronghold against the Roman Catholic adulteration of the doctrine. They say: no salvation without living faith, which contains explicit knowledge, assent and confidence, and comes from hearing the gospel; whilst the Catholics neither know, nor teach, nor preach, what saving faith is; thence their adulteration of the doctrine. Yet, in spite of the most positive opposition to this source of all false doctrine, the lack of a clear and unmistakable doctrine of faith, the same adulteration undeniably creeps into the Lutheran dogmatics, even with the most orthodox representatives of our Church, and the cause again is this doctrine of regeneration by baptism. Without faith there is no salvation, no justification, no regeneration, and no grace with God. Hence baptism must contain faith, in order to bestow these gifts; and yet infants cannot hear the preaching of the gospel nor have the necessary elements of saving faith. Therefore the dogmaticians maintain that faith is produced in children through baptism, although they confess that they cannot clearly understand what kind of faith this is. Gerhard says, (Schmid, p. 567): "We are not solicitous about the mode of this faith, but we simply acquiesce in the fact, that infants really believe." Chemnitz (ibidem): "The Holy Spirit is poured out upon those baptized, that being justified they may become heirs of eternal life, and this is called the faith of infants; * * though faith cometh of hearing in another way in intelligent, sensible, willing adults, than in infants not having yet the use of their reason;" and again, (p. 479): "We call that action and operation of the Holy Spirit in infants faith, and assert that infants believe." They call it faith, knowing that it is not what every one understands by faith; calling by this name something which is as little the saving faith as what the Roman Catholics substitute in its place.

Again, the *efficacy of the sacraments* is at first the same as that of the word of God, depending on the faith of the receiver. This is one of the most warmly defended positions against the Catholic doctrine of the efficacy of the sacraments, *ex opere operato*, without any emotion in man, *in obicem non*

ponentibus. But although our dogmaticians protest most earnestly against this doctrine, they are brought to teach the same by their doctrine of baptismal regeneration. That infants oppose no hindrance (*obicem non ponere*) to the operation of the sacrament, is expressly mentioned, and on that ground infancy is recommended as the most appropriate time for the application of the sacrament,—hence an operation by the act without an inner emotion. Thus the sacrament of baptism was soon called an *officino regenerationis.* To prevent the charge, that with this they had really again taken up the Catholic doctrine of the efficacy of the sacraments, they maintained that the efficacy of infant baptism was not without faith, which was in baptism created by the Holy Spirit, forgetting that this was now no longer the original doctrine of the efficacy of the sacrament on condition of faith. For that faith, which they represented in baptism, was not a condition, under which the sacrament was efficacious, but the gift of the Holy Ghost given without any condition or any emotion, wrought apparently in a magical way. Or they tried to preserve the appearance of the original doctrine by showing, that the word of God was present in the sacrament as the agent of grace, since it was understood, that every operation of grace, also even in the sacrament, is effected by the word of God. But that word, which is a component element of baptism, is not the word preached, heard, and received by faith, but the spoken word, working without hearing, in a magical way. Or they called to their aid the prayer or the belief of the church, of the parents or sponsors, in order to save or recover the simplicity and harmony of the system, otherwise so grandly plain and clear, which was lost by the signification of baptism as regeneration, and the necessity of joining this doctrine to the system.

A revision of this doctrine of regeneration by baptism seems *unavoidable*, if our doctrine is to preserve or rather recover the claim to simplicity and consistency, which was so distinctly its character at the time of the Reformation, when it took the hearts of the people as by storm. The simplest means towards that end might be to drop this conception, if

it were possible. We might blame the old dogmaticians for having gone too far, and free the church from a superfluity, which in the opinion of many greatly injures. But such a remedy is not so easily applied, since our Confessions also contain this conception, and, chiefly by means of the Smaller Catechism, it has become the common property of our Church, and is widely known as such to our adversaries. In spite of all protests that our Church does not teach such a doctrine, our people would not allow to be taken from them, what our agendas pronounce in many formulas, viz., that the baptized child by virtue of the act of baptism is regenerated and has become a child of God. They are right, because our Church does teach that, and must teach it; for the word of God teaches it. What is needed, seems to be only that we reach a better understanding of the real meaning of this doctrine. This seems to us indicated by the strange way, in which our main Confession, the *Augustana*, speaks of baptism. It indeed bestows the name of regeneration on it, but in the *Locus de Baptismo*, where we must expect to find the most significant word about it, this word is not used at all. Through baptism, it says, "grace is offered," and "children are dedicated to God and received into His favor." Apparently the Augustana is not ready to give up the conception of regeneration by baptism, nor quite ready to receive it in the common sense. There seems to be a groping after the right solution, which as a task of abstract dissection was left to be done in a time less fresh than that of the Reformation, but more trained in dissecting things and words, matters and conceptions. Such a time is ours, and there seems to be to-day a general endeavor to solve the difficulty still besetting the doctrine of baptism. We offer the following attempt at solution: We proceed from the term *regeneration*.

It is known that the word regeneration (*παλιγγενεσία*) occurs but twice in the New Testament, namely in Tit. 3 : 5, and Matt. 19 : 29, although similar expressions are of more frequent occurrence. In the latter passage it signifies a change of the old world to a new order of things, otherwise

described as the new heaven and the new earth, which is to take place on the last day, on the return of our Lord. It is evident that this passage contributes nothing to the clearing up of the meaning of regeneration by baptism.

The former is the main proof-passage of our subject. From this chiefly, combined with John 3 : 3, 5, it has taken its origin, as may be gathered from its verbal reception into the text of the Smaller Catechism. It is evident, that this passage denotes by the word regeneration a change taking place in man, but what is this change? There are two great changes in particular, mentioned in the New Testament. 1. Moral improvement. 2. Awakening of faith.

Moral improvement is the most striking change which man can undergo. God's word inculcates it in many passages as in Eph. 4 : 25, 28, 31; Rom. 13 : 13; Gal. 5 : 22–26; Rom. 13 : 8–10; Col. 3 : 14; 1 Pet. 1 : 15, 16. And Christians are not only admonished to walk so, but they do show the virtues of their father in heaven. The apostle reminds them that they were in trespasses and sins, wherein in time past they walked according to the course of this world, (Eph. 2 : 2). He reminds them as of something apparently familiar to them, that "those who do not obey the word be won by the conversation of the wives, whilst they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear," (1 Pet. 3 : 1, 2). And the Lord had predicted it, as it were, by His admonition: "Let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your father which is in heaven," (Matt. 5 : 16); and again Jno. 13 : 35. And Christians have at all times proved such a change, as made their light shine before men and have had "a good report of those which are without," (1 Tim. 3 : 7), "that their righteousness exceeds that of other men," (Matt. 5 : 20). As the heathen of the first times said of them: "How do they love each other!" so they have had the report at all times, that there is a love among them, which is not of the world.

Can the transition to this moral life, can this moral change be the regeneration of the Bible?

John calls the new moral life a being born of God, and im-

plies by such and similar expressions, that the moral change may perhaps be what is meant by regeneration. This opinion may be confirmed by Paul's speaking of morality as one of the fruits of the Spirit and as an attribute to a son of God, (Gal. 5 : 22; Rom. 8 : 9, 14), by his bringing it into connection with the inheritance of the kingdom of God, (1 Cor. 6 : 9). As far as regeneration signifies a great change, it may be applied to this moral change, since it is so great that the difference between the old and the new life can be designated as the one born of God and the other of the devil, the one led by the Spirit, the other by the flesh, the one heir of the kingdom of Christ, and the other unable to enter into it. Moreover, regeneration means more, namely, a sudden, total change, whereas moral change means rather a gradual development. The good does not conquer suddenly in the warfare with the evil; victory is won by advancing step by step. Now and then an evil propensity may be uprooted, once and forever, but as a general thing "the old Adam with all his sinful lusts and affections must be drowned and destroyed by daily sorrow and repentance, and the new man daily arise, which shall dwell in the presence of God in righteousness and purity forever." And the common experience of sad relapses causes an experienced Christian to hope and to pray that he "may finally obtain victory." But certain pet sins will remain as special weaknesses all through life, and the more so, when a Christian lays aside the weapons of constant warfare, trusting to be perfect.

In such an incessant combat, moral change can scarcely deserve the name of regeneration, which apparently is to signify a sudden, total change. If a moral change could be attained that would make a man perfect or wholly sanctified, then it might be called regeneration. But such an assertion is so utterly at variance with God's word, that it is difficult to understand how it can be made in the face of it. By the side of the confessions of the apostles John and Paul, it is certainly highly presumptive to profess perfection. But if a Christian be converted to perfect holiness, such a change could no doubt bear the name, as far as the completeness of

the change is expressed by it. However the claim to it becomes still more doubtful when we consider that it signifies in the New Testament, not only the greatness of the change, but also a fitness for the kingdom of God, or that state of mind which qualifies for or introduces into it. It would be a great aberration from the doctrine of the New Testament, to call moral improvement regeneration, as if to improve morally would give the sinner entrance into the kingdom. "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness would have been by the law, but no man is justified by the law in the sight of God; for the just shall live by faith." "The law worketh wrath; therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace." This doctrine of moral improvement, which justifies before God, is the object of the warm and zealous opposition of Paul, chiefly in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians, and it pervades all his writings. "By grace," says he, "are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by his grace." "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh,—that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us." If regeneration is a moral improvement, then justification comes not through grace, but through merit; not by faith, but by our own power.

Moral improvement then can certainly not be the regeneration of the Bible, which is the entrance into the kingdom of God. Moral change is not even an independent process; it is altogether dependent on another change, which must make room for this to take place; namely, on faith. Faith, receiving the gift of the Holy Ghost, contains in it also the power of doing good deeds, acceptable in the sight of God and of men. Whatever there is of true morality, can be reduced to faith as its true source. In order then to understand moral improvement, it must be viewed as the effect of

faith, the good fruit of the Spirit. Hence to find the real beginning of the new life, the real entrance into the kingdom of God, to find what regeneration must be and is, we must pass on to the second great change that the New Testament mentions, to the *awakening of faith*, in order to see whether this may be the regeneration.

The New Testament lays greater stress on this second change, by which faith is created in man, by which he is raised from the state of an unreconciled and unredeemed sinner to that of a reconciled child of God, pardoned in Christ, than on moral renovation or sanctification. This is the change which Paul describes so ardently and distinctly in the epistle to the Romans; this the change represented so vividly by the conversion of Paul, by the example of those converted on the day of Pentecost, and of Cornelius and his friends, etc.; a change never perhaps more distinctly and more impressively set forth, as far as the feeling is affected by it, than in the language of Paul: "O wretched man that I am; who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." This change from unbelief to belief, is the greatest that man can experience in this life. In feeling, thought, and moral power, it is so total a change, that the apostle can say: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away, behold all things are become new." This change lies so entirely out of the reach of the power of man, that this, more than anything else, is signified as the exclusive work of the Holy Spirit. "No one can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." "We have received the Spirit of adoption whereby we say: Abba father!" This is that special gift, which is even beyond the understanding of the natural man, to whom "it is foolishness, who does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." This gift or operation of the Holy Spirit must be carefully distinguished from all His other gifts, as the greatest, as well from the miraculous operations of the Spirit in speaking with tongues, and other appearances

in the apostolic Church, as from the operations in the special organs of God for the execution of His plan of salvation, the prophets and the apostles. These latter operations of the Holy Spirit raise the chosen ones above every other human greatness, however they leave John the Baptist, the greatest among them that are born of women, who is more than a prophet, less than him that is least in the kingdom of heaven. On the contrary, the truest gift of the Holy Spirit, faith in the Lord Jesus, makes men enter into it. The Holy Spirit was not given before this special gift was poured out upon the first Christians on Pentecost, although holy men had before been moved by the Holy Ghost. Again, this special gift must be distinguished from the prevenient operations by which men are drawn to Christ, enlightening them about the being and existence of God, (Rom. 1 : 19, 20), about His will, (2 : 14, 15), about His kindness, (2 : 4), and His wrath (1 : 18); leading them to repentance, (2 : 4), and longing after Him (8 : 20–22). This more general operation of God upon the human mind is already ascribed to the Holy Ghost in the Old Testament (Gen. 6 : 3; Ps. 51 : 12; 143 : 11), and also in the New Testament (Jno. 16 : 8–11). This general and that miraculous operation are to be well distinguished from that in the consummation of the kingdom of Christ, which creates faith in Him. This alone is *the* Holy Spirit, which was not given before Pentecost.

Is this coming of the Holy Spirit into the human heart, is this inner change, by which He enters it, is this awakening of faith, what the scripture means by the word regeneration?

The two most significant passages about regeneration furnish no distinct answer, neither Tit. 3 : 5, nor John 3 : 3, 5, which has instead of the term regeneration, the similar one: to be born again (or perhaps, to be born from above). According to both, baptism and the coming of the Spirit may coincide, so that regeneration would then take place in the act of baptism, and the Spirit would be given at the same time; or they may be separated in some way, so that then we would have two agencies working for regeneration, the act of baptism and the following operation of the Spirit;

or baptism may be the regeneration proper, and the working of the Spirit attached to it for the production of the same end. We receive no better help from those passages which mention the word of God as means of regeneration, *i. e.* from 1 Pet. 1 : 23; James 1 : 18; for the word of God is present in anything that may be regarded as an agent of regeneration. As a consequence of this lack of clear decision about the meaning of regeneration in these passages, the opinions of the theologians vary so largely. Their views can in the main be reduced to two. Regeneration either takes place in baptism or in the awakening of faith. The scripture seems to favor the first, but not so clearly as to make the acceptance of this view unavoidable. Experience, on the contrary, distinctly recommends the other opinion, that the awakening of faith or conversion must be regarded as regeneration. The latter opinion must be expected to be and is uttered in our Church from the beginning, since it was Luther above all others, who opened a new understanding of the wonders in a life of faith. Thus our Confessions teach, that the conversion to faith in Christ is *a* true regeneration. But besides such expressions (indicated also in this quotation cited from the Formula of Concord by the indefinite article "*a*," not "the," which leaves room for another regeneration), there remains the doctrine of regeneration by baptism; and the task of harmonizing the two, causes the old dogmaticians no little difficulty, as shown above. Pietism decided in favor of regeneration by conversion; but of late there is a determined reaction in favor of the older opinion of baptismal regeneration,—with what right and what result, is the question.

The opinion that faith, or conversion, is regeneration, is favored, as it seems, by the *law of the development of human nature*, which is not only progressive, as moral renewal chiefly represented it; there is besides this in the natural endowment of man a capability for sudden action, resting on the privilege of freedom, of breaking the course hitherto followed, and taking a new departure. "The wicked may turn from his way and live." The power of habit, of the past

over the future, is great, so that with good reason the boy is said to be the father of the man ; and yet man is not the slave of the past. It is the royal privilege of him, who is made in the image of God, that he is free, even from his own decision and choice, that he can create something new, at least within himself. This freedom is different, in the different relations of life. In outer affairs habit is often almost unconquerable, in others it is easier to break; in nothing is man freer to leave the old and to begin a new life, than in the relation to God. In this respect he can change, can turn to God on his death-bed, even after a long life of godlessness. The more abrupt this transition from a godless life to one with God, the more violent the conversion, as with Paul or Augustine, the more appropriate application of the name of regeneration seems to it. However, this is not the normal use of freedom. If properly used, it need not come to such an instantaneous violent conversion. We can just as well conceive of a steady development of piety, of a constant walking before God and a turning to God, of an unrelenting wrestling with sin and a constant following after holiness ; and the history of the Christian Church furnishes remarkable instances of such a development, in which there was never a violent or abrupt change. Such a life is just as well an exercise of freedom, the whole life being a constant consent to what it finds itself in, hence a choosing or an exercise of freedom ; but the term regeneration is scarcely applicable to it, at most only at such times, as when the consciousness of what God has done for him, gains distinctness. But even this growing into full understanding of salvation can scarcely produce a change, which could bear the name of regeneration, when the development is completely normal, when education and instruction faithfully do what they can and ought to do. Morever, where the garden of God has been devastated, and the heavenly powers sleep in the Church, there the fire may break forth again abruptly and violently. Thus the name of regeneration is appropriate for the morbid, abnormal development of faith, whilst to the normal, steady, regular development it is scarcely applicable. This causes it to appear that

the abnormal development is preferable to the normal; and to avoid this, it seems necessary, not to bestow the name of regeneration on the awakening of faith, but on some kind of change, which would allow its application as well to the normal, as to the abnormal, hence to something beyond or before the development of the inner life. This could certainly not be anything but an objective act of God.

We next examine faith as to the *certainty of salvation*, in order to see whether it deserves the name of regeneration when viewed in that light. Saving faith is an experience of salvation and the grace of God. The believer perceives with a certainty, which excludes all doubt and uncertainty that the power of God has seized him. As certain as he was of himself and of his sinful and godless life, so certain is he now of his life in and with God. Thus faith is a sign of the high dignity of man, who knows himself to be related to God, "in whom he lives, moves and has his being," so that he can be as certain of his God as of himself. The experience of the nearness and grace of his God appears to the believer as a coming to himself, from perversion and unnaturalness to the right and holy nature, in thinking, feeling and acting. Thus faith is a new nature, a new man,—as long as man *feels* so; for this certainly is closely connected with the *feelings*. As the natural life depends on feeling, as I know my being healthy by my feeling well, and my being sick by my feeling ill, thus the certainty of the new life depends on feeling. I feel pain about my sin and am thereby certain that I have repentance, I feel joy over the forgiveness and the grace that God grants; I feel the peace and the love of God coming over me and am thereby certain the grace of God is with me. I feel new holy thoughts of confidence in God, of submission to his will, of composure in sufferings move within myself; I feel new instincts of love to my neighbor, of the love of Christ, which teaches me "to bear all things, to believe all things, to hope all things, to endure all things." I feel these new moral powers work in me and create the fruits of the spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, etc., and cannot doubt, that the Holy Spirit moves

me, a new born child of God. It is evidently a new life a new birth of God, which man experiences in this condition,—as long as he *feels* so.

But when this feeling changes, when the fresh waters of the new Spirit do not flow any longer, when the old forces of the flesh, the old disinclination to pray, the old selfishness and lack of charity, when envy, hatred, strife, wrath, etc., again make themselves felt, then the certainty of the new life, the certainty of the new birth of God is gone with the feeling. Yea, this absence of what has been, becomes the ground for an accusation: "You had the power of the Holy Spirit, and made it leave you; you have been in God, and have deserted Him." And who can prevent this change of the feelings? They are vacillating like the waves in the sea according to all experience, even that of the best and most holy Christian.

Therefore the experience of grace, being liable to change, can not save; for it lacks the certainty or surety. It is as well a source of faith as of doubt; the end of such a state of uncertainty is necessarily indifference and unbelief, unless there be a better hold for our salvation. Salvation is mine only when I am *completely* certain of my having it. He who doubts is like the wave in the sea; he who has no doubt, but is certain, is like the rock in the midst of the waves. The experience of salvation consequently furnishes no valid proof, no foundation of salvation; it is a valid proof only, when salvation has been wrought in me and is mine, even before and without my experience. Even the disappearance of the feeling of salvation does not harm, if such a feeling or experience is merely a sign of the otherwise firmly founded salvation. As certainly as that feeling has been brought forth, so certainly was and is that power within me, which produces it; and if this effect of the power has disappeared, the power still exists and can produce the same feeling again. If there is such an imperishable, unchangeable power, out of which my short-lived experience grew, then I am certain of my salvation, then it is given to me, then I have the regeneration. Thus we see in regard to the certainty of salvation,

that the experimental awakening of faith or conversion can not be the regeneration, if regeneration is to be the real beginning of the new life, produced by a creative power, the real entrance into the kingdom of God. This on the contrary points back to a beginning which must have been made within me prior to all possible experience on my side.

We shall see the same in examining conversion, thirdly, as to *its relation to God* and His judgment. We are justified before God by faith. Is the conclusion correct, that faith therefore is the power which makes us just before God, makes us new men or gives regeneration? Faith is the greatest, the most holy, the most powerful attainment of which man is capable. It contains a power of loosening the fetters of thought, feelings, habits, dispositions, of fear and passion, which justifies us for speaking even in reference to merely human affairs, that faith is the victory which conquers all things. It contains a source of power which removes mountains, which often makes the impossible possible, which to this very day creates wonders, it is the crown of all human powers; and yet it is insufficient to create justification before God. We are not justified by the merit of our faith, but through faith. We can not make a single sin undone by faith, can not give by faith wherewith to redeem our soul, can not give satisfaction for our sin. Even a whole life of perfect sanctity could not atone for a single sin; even that would not change our condition. On account of past sins we would deserve the wrath of God and merit death. God alone can help and has provided for a redemption through Christ. For Christ's sake our sins are forgiven and adoption given to us, if we believe. The justice offered to us in Christ, is not a making just, but an accepting as just, a declaring just, an adopting and declaring as a child of God. It is offered through the Word of God, is accepted by faith. Prior to his acceptance by faith, man is not yet just nor redeemed nor a child of God, he becomes that by faith. Thus the transition or change falls into the act of accepting by faith; and faith seems to be the power which creates, contains and bears the new life. But as faith only accepts what is

offered to it, the real beginning may, after all, lie in the offer and not in the acceptance of it. The nature of this offering must decide this question. God has prepared salvation from eternity, has consummated it in Christ and sends the message of it into the world. Thus it comes to man, valid for any one who may appropriate it for himself. Brought thus, it is not more than the message of the possibility, that a man may become a child of God. To become a real offer for the individual, it must be brought individually to the subject. Faith would be the real beginning of the new life or the regeneration, if the offer were made by the Word only, viz., generally and conditionally, as the Word pronounces the offer. Faith would then really bring down the offer to the person. But then our justification would not be the being pronounced just by God, would no longer be a juridical, declarative act, seized or accepted by faith. The offer of God would essentially be an invitation to men, to carry out in reality that for which God would have given only the possibility. If the offer is meant in earnest, as a present or gift, and not only as a permission to us, to save ourselves, it must be brought by God himself to the individual. The appearance that my faith makes my salvation real, is dispelled, if God brings the offer to me individually that I shall be His child. Such an offer would be a real one, pronouncing the gift to be mine, before I accept it. Thus the conception of faith as being not the power to make us just, but to accept the offer of God to justify us, demands that the offer should be made not only by a general message, but by a personal application, not to be made by myself, but by God. Again the faith as *accepting justification* cannot be the regeneration or real beginning of the new life, but points back to an act of God preceding my acceptance in faith.

In all these respects faith proves to be not the real beginning of the new life, not regeneration, but points back to another beginning, which must be an act of God applied to me. Therefore, as the modern theory, that the awakening of faith or conversion is regeneration, is untenable, the older

theory forces itself upon us, that *baptism is the washing of regeneration.*

Examining now more closely, what the *Scripture* says about baptism, we shall see, that according to it, baptism is that sought for regeneration, to which faith points back.

That in John 3 : 5, water signifies baptism, we may call generally acknowledged, although some prominent voices still dissent. However, the introduction of baptism into the connection of this discourse between the Lord and Nicodemus, if by water baptism be meant, appears as an awkward one; it seems superfluous. The meaning of the whole passage is plain and complete, when we omit this word water: Man by his natural birth is flesh; through the Spirit he becomes spiritual and born anew. Moreover the efficacy of the Holy Spirit is perceivable; it is discernible as the effect of the Spirit, as holy, as coming from God. In this respect we know whence the Spirit comes; but as we do not know at what place the wind commences to blow, so we cannot tell at what point the operation of the Holy Spirit commences to lay hold upon the man. On the contrary, the introduction of the word "water" seems to point out the place where the operation of the Spirit commences. The connection might seem clearer and plainer, if the reference to baptism could be stricken from it, especially when the conviction is settled, that regeneration is the awakening of faith, or conversion. Hence the attempt to get it out of the way by tropical explanation. But this makes the insertion of water more awkward still, and is to-day almost given up, and instead it is acknowledged, that the act of baptism is here refered to. Consequently then some operation towards regeneration must be predicated of baptism. This operation now is either united with that of the Holy Spirit in the same act, or it is something peculiar besides the operation of the Spirit. The former opinion, according to which not only regeneration takes place in baptism, but also the Holy Spirit is given in the same, is the one maintained by the Lutheran orthodoxy, but also the one which leads it to the contradictions and inconsistencies shown above. The special operation of the

Holy Spirit, as given since Pentecost and in the name of Christ alone, is saving faith, and this cannot be shown in infant baptism, which was and is unanimously and especially recommended by the Lutheran Church. In order then to leave both infant baptism and faith unharmed by each other, it seems necessary to separate them and to explain our passage thus: Regeneration is effected by two agents: 1. baptism, 2. Holy Spirit; of which then the first as an instantaneous art would naturally represent the transition or regeneration proper, and the second the continuation, the inner realization. But what can baptism give, that is necessary besides the operation of the Holy Spirit? This implies faith or the religious renewal and sanctification, or the moral renovation. What remains for baptism?

In a similar way Tit. 3 : 5, allows as well the explanation, that the washing by which we are saved is one of regeneration and renewing, as the other, that we are saved by the two agents, the bath of regeneration, *i. e.* baptism, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit. Here as in John 3, these two explanations are possible, either that the act of baptism contains both regeneration and renewing by the Spirit, or that baptism be distinguished from the operation of the Spirit. Which of the two is the better, the correct one, neither the two passages named nor any that mentions baptism decides. When it is said, that in baptism we put on Christ, we are buried into His death, that by it we are sanctified, that by it we receive forgiveness of sins, that it is a covenant of a good conscience with God (the questionable ἐπερώτεμα need not be discussed here, since it has no bearing on the question before us), etc., none of all these statements about baptism furnish a ground on which to decide, whether the act of baptism alone gives regeneration, so that the Holy Spirit is one of its gifts, or whether besides baptism, as the first agent of regeneration, there is a second one, separated from the first, namely the Holy Spirit with the well known operation of saving faith.

The only ground on which to decide this question is furnished by the narrations of the Scripture about the actual

performance of baptism. In these we find that baptism and the reception of the Holy Ghost do not fall together in the same act. In Acts 10, the Spirit comes upon those assembled in the house of Cornelius, likewise as upon the apostles, so that they speak with tongues and magnify God, and thereupon says Peter, "Can any one forbid the water that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as me," and again: "God made no difference between them and us, and has cleansed their hearts by faith." What they had before baptism, is the Holy Spirit, who creates in them not only the miraculous gift, the speaking with tongues, but evidently also the essential gift of saving faith; and still there is a want of baptism. And all the other explicit narrations of the performance of baptism found in the New Testament give a similar result. After faith has been effected by the Spirit, often accompanied by miraculous gifts, there remains the want of baptism. They evidently prove that baptism has a peculiar value, which certainly is to be distinguished from the operation by which saving faith is effected. In what this consists we are no where told, and consequently must try and find it by an *examination of the act of baptism.*

The main point about baptism may be said to be conceded by all. All assert that baptism has no meaning or value attached to it by its performance, that it is not absolutely necessary, not necessary by itself, but necessary only because Christ has ordered it. Hence its meaning and value rest chiefly with its being instituted by Christ. What makes baptism to be what it is, is the fact that Christ has ordered it, and that it is performed by the order and in the name of Christ. Baptism as performed in Christ's name is an act of Christ himself, an act of God, in which He lays His hands upon us. Luther calls it on this ground eine That Gottes, ein Handeln Gottes mit uns (a deed of God, a dealing of God with us). Furthermore, what God wants and means with this deed, is also to be gathered from the institution. Baptism is administered into the name of the Triune God, and is an appropriating of the name of God, of Christ, to the

baptized, an adjudicating of the baptized to Christ. And this adjudication is not done by the order of the Church—thus it would express no more than a wish, a prayer, an admonition; it is done by the order of Christ himself. He, in whose name baptism is performed, pronounces the baptized to be His. Hence the baptism is the actual declaration of God, that the baptized person is His own, *it is the adoption of the baptized by God as His child.* This is what baptism is and means by its institution and it is completely sufficient to account for everything that is asserted of baptism in the different passages concerning it, and especially to account for its being called the washing of regeneration; and it can bear this name without giving it any additional force by joining the operation of the Holy Spirit with it, in order to make it strong enough. For the act itself understood in the light of the institution by Christ makes baptism *efficient unto regeneration.*

Faith is an act by which man chooses the life in Christ, but not an arbitrary, human act, for which he takes resolution and power of himself, and by which he makes of himself what he sees good to make, but an act, which no one could devise or has devised, for which we have only the freedom to accept or refuse what is offered to us, an act which wholly depends on the offer of God. This offer is founded on facts. The kingdom of God has been established, salvation has been provided for us, independent of our acceptance or faith. Faith has nothing to do but to recognize the accomplished fact. But even this acceptance is so difficult that it would be impossible for us to believe, if the *offer* reached us only in general words as the objective truth. It must urge our ever despondent heart to accept ("the love of Christ constraineth us"), must lead us to repentance, must inspire us with courage to believe, that I who am an enemy of God yet shall be a friend of Him; that I the greatest of sinners shall be pardoned; that God so loved me, although I did not seek after Him, that He gave His Son for me, that God's Son has died for me to redeem me, that all sins are forgiven me as if I had never sinned. To accept or believe this is so impossible for our natural way of thinking, feeling, willing, that our

thoughts must be brought into captivity tot he obedience of Christ; for the natural man knows nothing of this new being in the kingdom of God; he knows only his own godlessness and wretchedness. The things which eye has not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, must God prepare, or no human heart could understand them; and God did prepare them. He did so not only by causing Christ to be born, to die, and to rise again for us, by pouring the power of the Holy Ghost over all those who had been witnesses of all this, by bestowing on the timid hearts of little faith strength to believe all that they had read in God's word, had heard from Jesus' lips and had seen in Christ's life. God does it in the world by having the preaching of Christ accompanied by many signs which prove that salvation has appeared in Christ and exists and exerts a power, that is not of the flesh nor of the world, but of God. With such deeds God brings His offer to save by faith near to all hearts. But this general deed of an impressive message does not answer yet fully the divine purpose. God wants and loves every single soul; loves it indeed, and wills that it be saved. In order to help me to believe that He, even the living, everlasting God wants me, a poor, wretched sinner to be saved, and really, earnestly, warmly loves *me*, He must give *me* a sign, that He has not forgotten me, that He regards me and longs after me, that His love moves towards me. Such a sign need not be a wonder to-day as in the first times, as the wondrous pouring out of the Spirit upon the first Christians. The world is to-day full of the works of the Spirit, and every heart and every mind feels to-day, and must feel, the constraining power of such signs of the Spirit testifying for the divine power of the gospel. Besides these, one more sign is wanting to encourage me to the resolution to listen and trust to the precious message, and this is: It must be undeniably certain that God has seized *me* already, that His covenant is established with me, so that I need not do anything but to give up the resistance and surrender to the Stronger One, who with His love is stronger than my obstinate heart, and believe and concede to be true what is true

at all events, that God has loved me from all eternity. Such a sign of God that I am His own, such a living act of God, by which He applies the general message of Christ to my person and offers effectually salvation to me, is the baptism, which by His express order is offered to all, hence also to me, and consequently is, properly speaking, done by Him, and by which I am adjudged to the Triune God by a deed of God. It is a being seized by God, a being translated into the kingdom of His dear Son Jesus Christ.

Thus understood, baptism is an objective act of God, by which He adopts me, whether I accept His adoption or not. *It is not an inner change, but a change of my condition, a new birth*: For as the physical birth places me without my doing into this physical world, so baptism translates me into the kingdom of Christ, the powers of which surround, pervade and urge me, whether I want it or not. It is an objective regeneration, that indeed wants faith in order to bring about life and happiness, but remains irrevocably what it is, as long as baptism can not be made undone.

But this entering into the objective forces of the kingdom of God must be well *distinguished from the merely living in the outer kingdom of Christ*, the Christendom. He too, who lives in this, is surrounded and even pervaded by the heavenly powers of the kingdom of God. Even a heathen, living in the midst of an active Christian community, can not but feel the force with which the quiet walking of Christians wooes for Christ and draws to Him; and even where a Chrstiani community has lost the first love and has become cold, even there the traces of the power of the Spirit are commonly visible, though sometimes they are faint indeed. He, then, who lives but in the outer Christian world, has in a measure already been translated into the kingdom of God; but the gift of baptism is quite different. Baptism, too, is a being translated into the kingdom of God, into the life created by the Holy Spirit; and thus it is to many nothing but an empty ceremony, giving nothing that living in the Christian world does not give, at most representing in a solemn form, what is evident by itself, that the baptized has entered

the Christian world and is going to live in it. Before he becomes conscious of what has been done to him in baptism, the value of this is dormant yet; he has hardly more by being baptized than he who is not baptized and lives otherwise under the same circumstances. The difference is great between the two when consciousness takes possession of the actual fact. There is a certain strangeness for the unbaptized about the Christian custom, Christian doctrine, Christian peace and happiness, etc. He may feel the value and the influence of all that upon him, so that he could nearly be persuaded to devote himself to it; but he does not yet belong to it. The baptized, on the other hand, knows it to belong to himself as the kingdom of *his* Lord, who has adopted him in baptism and translated him into the bond of union with Him, and at the same time has translated him into His kingdom on earth. All the Christian forces and influences that he feels and observes, are to him signs of the presence of his living, omnipotent Lord, who by the word of His power upholdeth all things, and in condescension has laid His mighty hands on him also, tenderly drawing His lost and wretched child to Himself and making him His own.

The difference rests not with magical or physical forces, but wholly *with our thoughts* and *our consciousness.* Thoughts are the links, that tie us to heaven, to earth, to hell. He whose thoughts are filled with heavenly truths, belongs to heaven; he who clings with his thoughts to the earth, belongs to this earth with its perishing glitter and lusts; he whose thoughts are inspired by the evil one, must bear the yoke of his master. The thoughts, not those which learning and the world of letters gave him, but the thoughts of his heart; the belief, not the creed of letters, but the belief of his heart, gives a man his real value. Even if the difference between the baptized and the unbaptized be a difference of thought only, it is sufficient for a world-wide distance that separates their lives from each other. Although being an act of God, being the actual adoption by God, baptism is nothing but a meaningless rite to him, to whom God is but a thought without power and life. But to him to whom God is the

consuming fire, the Mighty one who upholdeth all things with the word of His power; to whom God is the eternal love, which allows itself to be wearied with our iniquities, and longs to be one with us, as the Father and Son are one; to whom the love of Christ even to death is the turning point of the history of the world, and the love of all men to Christ the aim and end of all things; to him baptism, though considered by itself a small, an insignificant act, is infinitely more than all the mighty influences which Christianity has exercised or can exercise. The influences of the Christian Church, which draw to Christ, belong only to the subordinate sphere of prevening grace, baptism however translates into the communion of the gracious God Himself. As long as this actual possession of God's grace remains covered in sleeping consciousness, the possession is dormant and hidden, but existing nevertheless. When consciousness awakes, the scales fall from the eyes, which finally see what long since has been. As the real ownership of a fortune rests not with the consciousness of the heir, but with the will and deed of the testator, so the ownership of the adoption by God rests not with man's consciousness, but with God's will and deed. Baptism bestows this and makes me conscious of it and enables me to enjoy it.

This value of baptism remains unaltered in *infant baptism.* To make this valid, it is necessary that the act be performed; it is not necessary that consciousness be awake already at the the time of its performance, nor that repentance and faith be already developed, but only possible. The act performed by the order and in the name of God, has and keeps the meaning of the adoption by God, as long as it cannot be made undone, *i. e.* forever, and works, when the living faith of the Church gives the right explanation to this deed of God, as the most powerful admonition and inducement to repentance and faith. But it does not give forgivenesss of sins, life and happiness, before this faith is effected, on the contrary he who does not believe, is lost in spite of his baptism. But when faith awakes, the origin of this faith, the divine

power that created it, or drew it forth from the heart, lies far back in baptism. What God there and then laid down in me, comes to light in conscious faith. The foundation was laid there, the structure stands finished here; that is the root, this is the growing plant. Both are necessary parts of salvation. With infants they are necessarily separated by time, with adults they need not be, but must rather come together, since a converted heathen would not easily apply for baptism or be admitted to it, unless he believes.

This is the reason why the *narrations of the New Testament* about the administration of baptism show faith as preceding baptism, as all the explicit narrations of such cases refer to adults. The peculiar value of baptism is set forth with special significance by these narrations, as said before. It is with adults the confirmation of the covenant, which the converted longs to conclude with his God, but which is not firmly concluded, before this act, ordered by God, the sacrament of baptism, is performed. Regeneration or entrance into the kingdom of God is incomplete, till this actual adoption by God in baptism takes place. Conviction of the truth and acquiescence in it may be reached; but that is not yet saving faith; it must come to the certainty: "I know that *my* Redeemer liveth" or "I am sure that neither death nor life—may separate *me* from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus my Lord," or to the rock-like certainty of faith, which is the "substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." The adoption by God through an undeniable act of God is indispensable for such a certainty. Hence the want of baptism with Cornelius and the eunuch. Hence the strange reluctance towards baptism, which the missionaries sometimes find with the most enlightened among the converted from the heathen. They have a foreboding or feeling, that with baptism their election will be made sure. They have not yet fully approached God and His grace, as long as they are not baptized. Baptism makes an end to their undecided freedom, henceforward they belong to God, who has seized them and translated them into His realm of grace.

This also explains the peculiar way in which baptism and

faith and renovation and the operation of the Holy Ghost are thrown or crowded together in the two main passages on baptism. In adult baptism, God's deed and man's belief come so near together, that they are discernible only by abstraction. They are comprehended almost in the same moment. And since the power of renewing the whole life is given with saving faith, this too, renovation and sanctification, is in such cases an apparent gift of baptism. Moreover, the Holy Spirit works faith and sanctification; hence His operation at such a baptism coincides practically too with baptism itself.

If the above deduction is correct, then certainly the doctrine of our Church on baptism and cognate subjects needs a *revision*, which should draw the lines more sharply between the different conceptions.

The name of regeneration should be confined to baptism alone; whilst so far two conceptions of regeneration have been given, baptism and conversion; although the relative right to give the name of regeneration to the awakening of the faith, is undeniable. But the Scripture evidently gives the stronger claim to this name to baptism; and the teachings of experience, thoroughly understood, and consistency of thought and speech, distinctly suggest the same. If this were conceded, the next would be, to settle the meaning of the two kindred terms, conversion and awakening of faith. Both are applied to the great inner change, which produces repentance and faith. They might thus be distinguished, that the latter be the general name and the former the special one for a sudden change. The term, awakening of faith, is significant for both; the quiet, steady growth to conscious, living faith, which is never interrupted by a striking rupture with the past and a sudden breaking through of grace; and is just as significant for the abnormal development, when the baptized manifestly has fallen out of grace and hardened himself against it, and consequently grace has to break through the hard heart, as with Paul. The powers of grace and of the Holy Ghost were reposed in such a soul too, although unobserved; however everything was yet asleep, in a forced narcotic sleep; and the breaking through is a sudden awakening

of faith, when potentially it was existing long ago. At the same time the term conversion, would be properly applied as a special name to the abnormal development of faith, indicating a bearing off from a false and a turning into a new direction.

With this division or simplification of the conceptions in question, the two-fold location of regeneration would be avoided. Again the doctrine of faith would recover its simplicity and consistency, and we would be freed from the inconvenient necessity of demonstrating that infants have saving faith. For regeneration and saving faith need not then be regarded any more as falling together in the same moment. Baptism would be understood to give regeneration, and with it the grace of God, as far as God's actual offer goes; but the inner appropriation of grace by faith as not yet given by this act, but following in the course of the natural development, as soon as the full consciousness generates the ability to choose between good and bad and to decide for or against a life with God.

With that we would also have reached a more correct view of the life of children, which was spoiled in the system of the old dogmaticians by their doctrine of regeneration by baptism. The Scripture is far from regarding children as mature, entire Christians. It opposes very definitely to the age of a perfect man in Christ the age of a child, "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine," that does not yet know, what it is, and wants, and thinks and does; that thinks and speaks like a child, and must lay childish things aside, in order to become a man. They are therefore not responsible for themselves; the reponsibility for them lies in the main with their parents, who shall "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." They are even sanctified by their union with believing parents. However, that they are set up as examples to the disciples in spite of their imperfections or immaturity, must be understood as similar remarks about the faithful of the Old Testament. These are held up to us as fellows of our faith, even as models, yes, Abraham is called the father of

all believers; and yet it says, "they having obtained a good report through faith received not the promise, God having provided some better things for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." The Spirit not being yet given at this time, they all were merely in the time of preparation, at which God overlooked sin, whilst we live in the time of perfection, when sin is really forgiven and the Holy Spirit enters the hearts of men and makes them children of God. Likewise children are not yet in the perfect state of faith and of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, but can however be represented, or are indeed as a general thing, models of simplicity and devotion of faith, which to us are so difficult to attain, especially in these our modern times. A child has apparently no idea yet of the peace arriving from the forgiveness of sins, but it has the similar peace of an undisturbed innocence, which does not yet feel the unbearableness of sin, it is in this meaning, that the scripture speaks of innocent children. Furthermore, that God "perfects praise for Himself out of the mouth of sucklings," has as little to do with the conscious faith of mature Christians, as, that "the heavens declare the glory of God;" it is easily understood by him, who has an eye for the simplicity of a child's prayer and admires it in humbleness. But that the leaping of the fœtus in the womb of Elizabeth could be cited as an example of saving faith in infants, is a worthy set off to the absurd questions and deductions of the scholastics of the dark catholic middle-ages. We can dispense, as remarked, with all these oddities, since we need not prove any more the possibility or reality of saving faith in baptized infants, if we distinguish as suggested between regeneration and faith.

Finally the *demand of Höfling*, that the operation of the word and that of the sacraments be distinguished more satisfactorily, seems to be responded to by the recommended revision of our doctrine of baptism. The old proposition that the sacraments work in the same way as the word, is essentially established by it, and at the same time the difference is shown. Baptism then like the word effects what it prom-

ises, not before the awakening faith, not ex opere operato. Both word and sacrament offer salvation conditionally, on condition that it be accepted by faith. With both this offer is accompanied by the prevening power of the Holy Spirit, which induces and urges and draws to accept. However the offer is proposed in a different way by the two. The word offers the grace of God by placing it objectively before the mind as the faithful saying and worthy of acceptation, which the messenger recommends as worthy to be acccpted. On the other hand the sacrament offers the grace of God as a deed of God, which God has performed or given already without waiting for the acceptance, but expecting that faith will accept. Hence the sacrament is the divine confirmation to him, who commences already to believe, as Cornelius and the eunuch, proclaiming: "Thou art now my child; I have taken thee to me." It is an urgent appeal to him, who does not yet believe: "I have already adopted thee; thou art and will remain my own; wilt thou not now believe, that I love thee, and give thyself to me?" The word promises that grace shall follow faith; the sacrament grants grace preceding the response of faith, expecting to find faith responding to it. The operation of the sacrament then falls into the sphere of prevening grace following after the sinner who does not yet believe, nor is converted, in order to help him to turn to his God. Prevening grace comprises all those forces that influences the mind and heart of man, education, example, parents, congregation, divine service, prayer, sermon, instruction, etc. All these are human means, behind which grace remains hidden, operating as the quietly convincing and taking power of truth. In the sacraments grace addresses itself immediately to man, pleading: "Thou knowest that I love thee. Behold I stand before the door and knock. Open and let me come in, that I may sup with thee." The difference between the operation of the word and that of the sacraments scarcely exists for the natural understanding of the indifferent sinner; it is great and all important for him who has been roused from his sleep and longs for peace, for him who thirsts after the living

God. God in the word remains remote from the soul and, as it were, wrapped in by the general message that invites all, or by the word of the messenger who urges: "To me it is a dear precious word; believe it also thou my brother." God Himself comes nigh in the sacrament with the all-inviting word indeed, but at the same time with the quiet but unmistakable deed by which He takes man to Himself. Man is destined and capable above all that he shall and can do or think, seek or have, to seek and to have, to think of and to act towards his God, in whose image he is made, "in whom he lives, and has his being." He is destined for immediate relation with God above any other relation; and it is for this immediate relation, for immediate meeting, that God offers Himself in the sacraments to the believing soul. God offers indeed elsewhere also to approach us, to make us certain and glad of His love and His nearness, namely in prayer, in the worship of the congregation, in the communion of Christian works, of brotherly love, etc. But in all these and similar means, grace is mediated by human agents, human efforts. In order to receive it in these ways I must raise myself to meet my God, or I must be taken along by the believing messenger, by the faithful brethren. In the sacrament He comes to meet me prior to my motion to meet Him, without the mediation of men who induce me to follow after them. And this difference between these special means of grace and those subordinate ones rests solely with Christ's command and promise. The outer act performed with the water, with the bread and wine, otherwise insignificant and almost meaningless, becomes this efficacious, special means of grace only, because Christ wills it, and pledges his word: "By that thou shalt be mine (baptism) and I thine (Holy Supper)." By force of Christ's order and promise the sacrament is to him who thirsts after the living God, the fulfillment of his wishes, the quenching of this thirst. To him who does not feel this longing of the heart after God, though he be ever so holy and pious, though he have faith to move mountains, though he gives all he has to the poor, though he have all wisdom and understanding, to him the sacrament is perhaps still a

venerable rite, which must be performed, because it is ordered by the Lord in His unintelligible wisdom (or rather arbitrarily), but not the heaven on earth.

The mystery and darkness that surround the sacraments is in short the mystery of the relation between the soul and its Maker, comparable only with, but also surprisingly similar, to the highest and most tender relation of love between men, between friend and friend, between mother and child, between bride and bridegroom. He to whom the sentimentality of such a relation of love is unintelligible, will never be able to understand the value of the sacraments; for what they afford or offer is the most sentimental of all sentimental relations, which is that between the soul and its Maker. "Whom have I in heaven but Thee? And there is none upon earth that I desire besides Thee. My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever"—a folly and eccentricity to the sober and sensible man, who at most wishes to be morally noble and perhaps to reform the world to perfect morality; but it is and has always been the language of the very heart of him who thirsts after the living God. It is the language of these that the sacraments speak. Those, then, only who feel miserable without their God, and find comfort in Him alone, who see in the Lord Jesus not only the teacher come from God, but chiefly the Friend and Saviour of their souls,—those only understand the holiness and majesty of the sacraments.

Christianity has passed through a period in which the power of abstraction has somewhat dimmed the eye of the believers for the wonders of the kingdom of God, and the inspiring impulse of working for Christ's sake has turned the attention a little away from them. It seems the times are changing; we are recovering the old views and feelings, and with them a new appreciation of the sacraments, of which baptism would naturally lead the way.

ARTICLE V.

THE RITUAL OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

*Translated from the German of the Rev. Dr. E. STÆHELIN, of Basel, by Rev. G. F. BEHRINGER, Mendon, Ill.

In every Divine exhibition of grace and salvation, especially in all that proceeds from the Lord Jesus Christ—whose personal manifestation is a most forcible evidence therefore—the greatest and the profoundest thing in God's revelation and communication appears and is presented in the plainest and simplest form, in order that it may reach, and that it may be apprehended and comprehended by all. This is likewise the case in the personal appropriation of the atoning and life-giving communion of Christ, which is to be realized through the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. We can not conceive of a more simple and unpretending rite, of one that is more easily administered and comprehended as to its general significance, than the act which the Lord performed on the evening previous to his death, in the presence of His disciples, and in connection with which He spoke: "This do in remembrance of me." The said act, as all four records unanimously relate, consisted in this, that, at the close of the common meal (the Passover. meal), *He took bread, uttered words of thanks and praise for the same* (εὐλογήσας), *brake it, and then gave the broken pieces to His disciples*, (whether He placed it before them upon a plate, or whether He presented to each one individually his own portion, is altogether immaterial; yet one thing is certain, from the very nature of the act, that He did not put the bread into their mouths, but placed it within reach of their hands) and therewith said: *Take, eat* (these two words, not found in Luke and with Paul, are indeed doubtful, but do not seem to be necessary), *this is my body that*

*Herzog's "Real Encyclopædie," Vol. I., p. 47-61, (2d Edition).

is given for you (with Paul only τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, since κλώμενον is doubtless not authentic, as has been lately confirmed by the Sinaitic Codex) *this do in remembrance of me.* Likewise when the (Paschal) meal was completely ended, (the express remark of Paul, μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, necessarily presupposes a short interval between the two acts), *He took the cup* (either *the one cup*, or *one* of the cups that stood at hand), again, *He gave thanks*, (here it reads εὐχαριστήσας), and presented it to them with its contents, *wine mixed with water*, (for that the Jews always mixed the wine is an undoubted fact, as it is indeed commanded by the Talmud for the Passover feast); if the Lord had deemed it important to present pure wine to them, He would, without doubt, have ordered the cup to be specially filled therewith—concerning which we have no record), saying: *Drink ye all of it, this cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.*

With the same plainness and simplicity, bearing the same familiar character, the repetition of this ordinance was observed in the primitive Christian congregations, especially in the mother-church at Jerusalem. As with the public divine service in general, so with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, there was no ritual development, in our sense of the term, independent of and separate from the ordinary Christian life and conduct. But rather did the public divine service and the private conduct of life, communion with the Lord and fraternal, social communion, all unite in one, as indeed in truth it ought to be, and as it will be in the fulfillment of all things. After the manner of a great family, of a newer and higher kind, established by the Lord, not upon the foundations of a fleshly birth and blood relationship, but upon a common regeneration of God and upon a brotherhood in the spirit of redemption, did the believers consider and conduct themselves. Just as the members of a household assemble for family worship, for their meals and the social intercourse connected with the same; just as the Lord lived and labored in a similar manner with His restricted circle of disciples; so the primitive brothers and sisters in Christ gathered together day by day in their respective houses, united in

calling upon the name of the Lord, instructed and edified one another, partook of their plain meals in common, with simple and joyful hearts, and with thanksgiving to God. And as they were thus assembled around a common board, in the enjoyment of the most intimate and refreshing feeling of communion that can be conceived, there seemed to them to be but one thing lacking to complete their satisfaction: the presence in their midst of their beloved Lord and Master Himself, to pour out upon them His peace and to permit them to repose upon His bosom. But was He indeed absent? Had he not provided, when, at the last common meal, He called the bread His body and the wine His blood, and when He gave His disciples power to repeat the same, in order that His presence among them in the future should be perceptible to them, and should become operative in their consciousness? Now that they were assembled by themselves, as they were at one time together with Him, and yet lacked His bodily presence, it became for the first time very clear to them what Jesus had done and had wished in the Lord's Supper, when He blessed the bread as a memorial of Himself, as a pledge of His essential presence, as the means of their uninterrupted life-communion with Himself. Feeling the want of sacred love, in thankful, praise-giving faith, they assumed the authority to do what He had done for them, and in the most real and complete sense to become his "table-companions." One of their number—by preference very likely an apostle—arose, took bread, gave thanks and brake it, as he had seen his Master do, took the cup and passed it around; and either with or without the accompanying words they did "shew the Lord's death" in the most vivid manner, and renewed their remembrance of Him in their midst and in their hearts, just as if He were again standing bodily before them.

Exceedingly interesting it would be indeed, and how many theologico-confessional differences would be settled—according to human judgment—did we but know in what manner the Lord, and after him his Apostles, offered the prayer of thanks for the bread and the wine, and therewith consecrated the same. Was it done by a silent prayer or by an

audibly spoken one? Was it by an extemporaneous prayer, or by a formula in use at the Paschal supper: "Blessed be the Lord who caused the fruit of the earth to grow, who created the fruit of the vine!" Yet not even in a hypothetical way can anything be determined concerning this point; and herein we are again obliged to recognize the evidence of how little importance the Lord regarded permanent forms and formulæ in the ritual life of the Church as expressed in divine service. But rather in what a simple manner does He present the gift of eternal life, committing it to the activity of the Spirit, and leaving it to the changing necessities of the times, as to the form into which their appropriation and administration should develop. Nevertheless, from out of the darkness which envelops this point, this much is clearly evident; that the so-called consecration of the elements before their distribution, is not at all entitled to receive that significance which the Roman Catholic view, and the Romanizing tendency among Protestant Christians, would attach thereunto. According to the analogy of the Biblical types, the exhibition of the emblems in the presence of the Lord, their appropriate arrangement, the prayer of thanks and of petitions, showing the Lord's death and renewing his remembrance, with which the congregation was invited to commune—this is sufficient.

This manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper, *i. e.*, in close connection with the common, fraternal, love-feasts, involved a danger which would make itself felt wherever the Church should transcend the limits of its original confines, and thereby be released from the immediate and continued direction and supervision of the Apostles. This was the danger; that the partaking of the sacred nourishment, testifying of the presence of the Lord, would, in course of time, be connected and commingled with the reception of other food; that the institution of Christ would lose its independence and special importance; and that the Holy Communion would, as it were, disappear and be lost in the common communion, *i. e.*, in the ordinary meal. As is well known, we see in the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, how

this danger grew into a reality, and how the Apostle was therefore led to emphasize, in the most decided manner, the difference between the Lord's Supper and the common eating and drinking, even in the fraternal and social communion, and to declare the custom, theretofore observed, on the whole as neither suitable nor permissible (1Cor. 11 : 20, 33, 34).

It is not an easy matter to pursue the development of this matter from this time onward. For, as is well known, the history of the Agapæ—this name for the love-feasts occurs for the first time in the Epistle of St. Jude (12 v.), afterwards in Ignatius (ad. Smyrn. cap. 8), and in other ecclesiastical writers—and of their connection with the Lord's Supper, belongs to that part of Church history which can in no way whatever be cleared up, because the condition of things in the several localities and churches was by no means of a uniform character, but of a very varied and frequently of a diametrically opposite one. Whilst, *e. g.* from the description of the order of service by Justin Martyr (Apol. i, c. 85), and from the well-known letter of Pliny to Trajan (lib. x., 96), we learn that in Asia Minor, at the beginning of the second century, the Agapæ and the Lord's Supper were considered to be separate acts; on the other hand, the utterance of other Christian writers, and especially the decrees of the Councils (below mentioned) state, that in Western Europe and in Africa the union of the two, Agapæ and Lord's Supper, continued for a longer time, and that they were thus observed together by the churches there with a certain degree of tenacity. (According to Gieseler, Church History, i, p. 231, this connection of the two was the rule during the second century; the separation of the two was the exception, and was occasioned by the pressure of persecution. Compare likewise Socrates, v., 22, Sozam. vii., 19, in regard to the continued prevalence of the original usage (*i. e.*, the union of the two) in many parts of Egypt extending into the fourth century.) But the prevalent and ever increasing peril of abuse and desecration, connected with the numerical growth of the congregations, led the church authorities, if we be

permitted so to speak, to oppose the continuance of the old usage, and to favor a separation of two services (*i. e.*, of the Agapæ and the Lord's Supper). It was ordered that the celebration of the Eucharist should no longer take place at the close of the common supper, but that it should precede the same (as it is said to have been observed in Apostolic times, according to Chrysostom, Pelagius, Theodoret; compare the homilies and commentaries of these Church Fathers to 1 Cor. xi.), from which order the regulation originated, that fasting should precede the partaking of the Holy Communion. Only upon a single day, the day commemorating the institution of the Lord's Supper—Holy Thursday—did the Council of Carthage (392 a. 1), permit of the administration of this sacred ordinance after eating, in order thus to render possible the complete imitation of the last meetiug of the Lord with his disciples (Augustine ep. 54 ad. Januarium, cap. 9). Soon, further steps were taken to separate, in point of time, the communion from the ordinary supper, so that the latter should be held in the evening, either before or after the former, *i. e.*, in point of time, the Sacrament being appointed, &c., administered very early in the morning before dawn: *ante lucem.* And very decidedly and irrevocably was the separation established in Western Europe and in Africa, when, according to the action of the Council of Laodicea (363), Ambrose, Augustine, the Councils of Carthage, Orleans, and other assemblies, the celebration of the Agapæ was forbidden in churches or buildings consecrated for divine service, and remanded to private dwellings. Hence, as a matter of course, for the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the church became more and more the regular and the exclusive place. The Agapæ seem to have entirely disappeared about the beginning of the eighth century. They are mentioned for the last time in the proceedings of the Council Quinisextum in the year 692 A. D.

The first definite description of the celebration of the Holy Communion, apart from the Agapæ, is found in the above quoted passage of Justin Martyr. According to this, the sacred ordinance was administered in a very plain and simple

manner. "After the general prayer," so it reads, "we greet one another with a kiss. Thereupon *some bread and a cup of water mixed with wine* are brought to the presiding officer of the assembly of the brethren. This officer takes the bread and the wine, gives thanks and praise to the Father of the universe in the name of His Son and of the Holy Spirit, and returns special thanks that He has vouchsafed unto us this gift. The entire congregation responds at the close of this prayer with an Amen. Then the deacons, as we call them, present to every one in the assembly, bread, wine, water, which have been set apart by prayer; the absent ones receive the same at their homes. This meal we call the Eucharist." The celebration took place every Lord's Day, at the reception of new converts, after baptism, and also whenever the necessity existed and a company of believers was assembled. (Augustine writes, in Epist. 118 ad Januar. cap. 2: "Some commune daily, others on certain days; in some places the Supper is held on Saturday and Sunday; in other places only on Sunday). What is surprising, in comparing the preceding with the soon following practice, is this circumstance, that in no wise does the Sacrament appear to have been administered as a "Mystery-Celebration," but altogether as a public service, just like the ordinance of Baptism, with which the above description of Justin Martyr is directly connected. The same conclusion may be drawn from statements found in the writings of Ignatius, Tertullian, Januarius, and others, concerning the earlier form of celebrating the Holy Communion. In the "Apostolic Constitutions," for the first time, the Sacrament is represented as a district rite appointed for the elect (πιστοὺς), from which the profane (unbelievers, Jews, heathen), the catechumens, the excommunicated, the penitent, &c., are excluded; the doors are closed and carefully guarded by special officers, and even the believers assembled to partake of the communion are particularly examined and prepared.

The regulations, which the 8th book of this oldest of all church-rituals (the so-called Liturgy of St. James the Less) contains concerning the administration of this sacred ordi-

nance, furnish us for the period of the third and fourth centuries with the following comprehensive picture. After the preceding general divine service is ended, the deacon begins "the Mass of the Faithful," with the word: "Let none of those, who are entitled to remain, depart." Thereupon follows a silent prayer, the general prayer, the offertory (*i. e.* the presentation of the offerings of bread and wine brought by members of the congregation), which the deacon with his assistants collects, and from which a portion, needed for the celebration, is taken. The one bread—for there was always but one (loaf)—which received the pre-eminence, was called *hostia*, the sacrificial lamb. When all the offerings had been gathered, and the portion needed for the celebration had been selected, and prepared, the celebration proper was opened with a benediction and with the holy kiss. The profane, the catechumens, &c., were then requested to withdraw, the clergy washing their hands as a sign of their inward purification. The admonition was then given: "Let no one have aught in his heart against his neighbor! Let no one approach in hypocrisy! Lifted up unto the Lord, let us stand in awe and with trembling at the sacrifice!" Then certain church officials presented the bread and the wine to the view of the congregation and placed the same upon the communion table, on both sides of which two sub-deacons immediately took position with small fans of thin leather or linen, to ward off, by a gentle movement, the flying insects, and thus to prevent them from falling into and defiling the wine. After that the bishop (presbyter), in an elegant robe (the remaining clergy on the right hand and on the left) advanced to the communion table, and began that part of the liturgical service exclusively belonging to him. "Lift up your hearts," cried he, whereupon the congregation responded: "We have lifted them up unto the Lord." The bishop: "Let us give thanks unto the Lord;" the congregation: "It is meet and right." Hereupon followed a prayer lasting one-half hour, reciting and praising the gracious and marvelous acts of God in the creation of heaven and earth, and in the providential, salvation-working leadings of his elect (Abel,

Seth, Noah, Enoch, Abraham, &c.), from Adam and the fall of man until the manifestation of the incarnated Son, and ending with a "Tersanctus" to the One blessed forevermore. Next followed a petition to Christ, whose history, in birth, life, and death, was recapitulated in beautiful, spiritually edifying expressions, and special emphasis was laid upon the institution of the Lord's Supper. Finally a series of petitions for the aggregate clergy of Christendom, for the civil authority, for the people, for pious women living a life of chastity unto the Lord, for parents and children, for those in captivity, for the exiled and the banished, for travelers by land and by sea, for persecutors and heretics, for all and everything needful to the inner and the outer life. The gathered thank-offerings, the so-called sacrifice, were then presented and consecrated unto the Lord and accepted of Him. Another prayer was offered expressing unto the thrice Holy One the thanks of the congregation. Then followed the confession of faith (the Apostles' Creed) and the Lord's Prayer. Whereupon the deacon said: "Let us now give earnest attention;" and the bishop: "The Holy to those who are holy!" The congregation responded: "One is holy; One is God; One is Jesus Christ to the honor of God the Father, blessed forevermore! Amen. Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and good will to men. Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord, the Lord and God who hath revealed himself unto us. Hosanna in the highest!" After a short pause, the precentor led off with the communion psalm, the 34th, (so called because of the 9th verse: "taste and see that the Lord is good"), and during the singing of this hymn, the communicants approached the table, at which the bishop presented to them the bread and the deacon the cup. The bishop, presbyters, deacons, sub-deacons, lectors, and cantors, communed first; then the monks; after these the women standing in special relation to the congregation: deaconesses, nuns, and widows; then the children, and finally the remaining adults. The formula used in distributing the bread was: "The body of

Christ;" in presenting the cup: "The blood of Christ, the water of life;" the communicant responded each time with a loud "Amen." The bread used was, as in all ages of Christian antiquity, the ordinary, leavened bread, as was used at home; the wine was mixed with water. The prayer of thanksgiving closing the service was relatively short, and, as to its special import, was likewise a petition. With a very specific benediction the congregation was dismissed.

The manner in which the celebration of the Lord's Supper was further developed and modified, until in the course of the sixth century it assumed the form of the Roman Catholic Mass (Gregorian Ritual), will be presented in the article, "The Mass and the Sacrifice of the Mass." The manner of celebrating the Mass will also be described and explained, so that we may here omit the further consideration of the Roman Catholic way of administering this sacrament.

On the other hand, several details are to be mentioned as well of earlier as of later times, which are needed for the completeness of the above given picture. In regard to the time of celebration, we have already noticed, that, as a rule, this took place very early in the morning. The Christmas and Easter communions formed the only exceptions to this rule, and, up to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, were celebrated at midnight. As memorial signs of the original night communions, the custom of using burning tapers continued to be observed, which custom a portion of the Protestant Church, *e. g.* the Saxon and Bavarian, has retained. As the proper day for communion, from the fifth century onward, there appear especially the three great festivals: Christmas, Easter and Whitsuntide, upon which days, in some localities, it was even made obligatory to receive the Lord's Supper. (Thus the Synod of Agde in France, 506 A. D.: "Laymen who do not commune on Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, are neither believed nor held to be Catholics.") In later times, as is well known, this obligation was restricted to Eastertide; yet a more frequent communion, or participation in the daily Mass, was not excluded.

In the beginning, the bishops or the presiding elders of the

congregation were the only persons entitled to administer the communion, (thus Justin Martyr and Ignatius: "It is not permitted to administer the Holy Communion without the presence of the bishop:" Constitut. Apostol.). The presbyters could consecrate only under the authority and direction of the bishops. The part of the deacons was but to assist in the external service. A regulation as late as the time of King Pepin, 755 A. D., still enforced this order. But when in the Middle Ages the bishops, more and more, grew to be great lords that busied themselves with other matters rather than with ecclesiastical functions, they rarely appeared at the altar and did nought but celebrate the so-called high masses. The consecration and administration of the Sacrament was now regarded as the outflow of priestly dignity and power, and was not only permitted to the ordained (presbyters), but imposed upon them as their first and strictest duty. From the fourteenth century onward, this function could not be denied even to the monks, although for them many a canonical restriction remained. The details regarding the preparation of the celebrant we shall not consider, because the prescribed prayers and devotional acts to this end (confession, fasting, washing the hands, ritual garments) partly do not appear to have been established in a firm, universally valid observance, partly have more meaning for the hierarchical arrangements than for the Lord's Supper.

Concerning the preparation of the communicants, it does not seem to me to be clear, from the data at hand, whether in olden times, from the second and third centuries onward, special preparatory or confessional services were held or not. As the more probable thing it occurs to me that the sermon preceding the communion, had reference to the Sacrament, inasmuch as we find in the Homilies of St. Chrysostom the most earnest admonitions to prepare oneself for a worthy reception of the Lord's Supper by a strict self-examination and exercise of good works. As a rule, the Church Fathers apply the parable of the marriage of the king's son to the New Testament Eucharist, and call upon Christians to come as worthy guests to this heavenly feast. Further conditions of a wor-

thy participation were these: fasting, clean and becoming clothing (for the female sex usually a head-dress of white linen, called the *Dominicale*), in places washing of the hands, finally the kiss of peace and love (*φίλημα ἅγιον*) immediately preceding the celebration.

In receiving the Sacrament in primitive times, the communicants approached the altar in pairs, and partook of the same standing (*ὄρθοι πρὸς κύριον ἑστῶτες ὦμεν*, Const. Apostol. viii., c. 12). Concerning the behavior to be shown, "careful and reverential," Cyril of Jerusalem furnished minutely specified directions. In later times the laity were excluded from the altar and choir—at first the women—and received the elements at the chancel rail which separated the choir from the nave of the church. Until the ninth century, the bread was placed into the hand, then directly into the mouth, in order to prevent the continuance of the ancient and oft forbidden misuse of taking it home. Kneeling in the reception of the Communion was not practiced until the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and not until a much later period did it become a universal custom. On the other hand, the Benediction after the Communion was received kneeling, at a very early day.

Regarding the elements of the Lord's Supper, it was the custom in the Eastern Church to make use of *leavened* bread, whilst in the Western Church *unleavened* bread was made use of. Reliable indications of the latter, however, are not found until the ninth century. "The Day of Unleavened Bread," as the day upon which the Lord's Supper was instituted, was cited as authority. The question, moreover, was declared to be an *adiaphoron*, *i. e.* a non-essential matter. The well known Council of Florence, 1439 A. D., expressed this opinion, but it was not agreed to by the authorities in Constantinople.

The form or shape of the bread was an imitation of the Jewish Mazzoth: a round, thin cake (cracker), also called Easter-cake, or flat-cake, which, in later times, yet not before the twelfth century, very easily and of itself, as it were, diminished to the size of the sacramental wafer. In every age it was impressed with a special sign, figure, or letter—at times with a

cross, or with *A* and Ω; at times with *Jesus*, *Deus*, or with the picture of the Risen One; since the twelfth century with a half-length portrait of Christ. That the Syrian Jacobites were accustomed to eat oil and salt with the bread, the Artotyrites even adding cheese, is hardly worth while mentioning.

Concerning the wine, the entire Church of primitive times mixed the wine with water, and both the Greek and the Roman Churches have retained this custom.* In regard to the color of the wine, the Eastern Church made no distinction between red and white wine; the Western Church gave the preference to the red, with the single exception of the Church of Milan, which, on account of greater purity, preferred to use white wine.

Several substitutes for wine were used among the heretical sects; some exceedingly improper and offensive (compare Epiphan. Hæres. xxvi., §3 and 4); others of a more innocent nature, as, among the Eucratites, water; and again among others, milk, honey and unfermented grape-juice. Here and there in the Eastern Church, even among orthodox believers, the so-called σίκερα, a strong drink prepared of dates, fruit and grain, was employed. Yet the Church did not cease to declare all this to be inadmissible, and to insist upon the use of real wine.

It is well known, that the practice of breaking the bread before its distribution, calling to mind the breaking of the body of Christ, was an ancient custom, and has been retained in the whole Eastern and Western Church up to the present time—with the single exception of the Lutheran Church. Herewith is connected, among the Greek and Roman Christians, a

*With this difference, however, that: 1. In the Greek Church a greater quantity of water is permitted (among the Syrians, in case of necessity, as much as three-fourths water); whilst, in the Roman Church, it has always been maintained that the wine should be decidedly the predominating ingredient, and that a few drops of water would suffice to express the mystic union. And that: 2. In the Eastern Church, *cold* water was added to the wine *before* consecration, and *warm* water immediately after the distribution of the bread, whereas in the Western Church cold water was added but once, and that *before* consecration.

commingling of the bread and wine (unio, commixtio, ἁγία ἕνωσις), which is intended to represent how body and blood are one, and ought to go together. The Greek Christians lay such stress upon this, that they retain this commingling even in the distribution of the elements: *i. e.*, they dip the broken piece of bread into the same, and then, by means of a spoon, present the same to the communicant. Before the *manner* of imparting the elements, in the Greek Church, had been definitely fixed, and before the laity, in the Roman Church, had been deprived of the cup, very frequently there was used the so-called *festula eucharistica*, the eucharistic pipe, in order to avoid every possibility of spilling a single drop of the sacred drink.

The formula of distribution remained, so far as the question can be determined, throughout all antiquity, and up to the time of Gregory the Great, in the statement already given: "the body of Christ, the blood of Christ, the drink of life." From that time onward are found the more explicit formulæ: "May the body (blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul," or "May the body (blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ keep thee unto eternal life;" or "The body and the blood of the Lamb of God, which was given for the remission of sins;" or "May the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be unto thee the salvation of thy soul and body;" or "May the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ avail for thee unto the remission of sins and unto eternal life." Whenever, as was the case for a certain length of time even in the Western Church, the *intinctio* (*i. e.*, the dipping of the bread into the wine) was retained, the following formula was used: "May the body of our Lord Jesus submerged in his blood preserve thy soul unto eternal life." Among the Oriental (or Eastern) Christians these additional amplifications occur: "This is verily the holy, precious, true body of Immanuel, the Son of God." "This is verily the precious, true blood of Immanuel the Son."

Concerning, finally, the co-operation of the congregation in the sacramental celebration, by means of the singing of psalms and hymns—as we have already intimated the same

in the foregoing description—this was the custom in the East at a very early time, probably from the very beginning. In the West it prevailed universally in the fourth century, as we learn from *August. retractat.* lib. ii, cap. 11. Besides the above mentioned 34th Psalm, the following were especially preferred: 133d, 42d, 145th, 51st. From the time of Gregory the Great the "Agnus Dei" assumes a very important place in the Roman celebration of the Sacrament. It was sung by priest and people responsively during the breaking of the bread, and was incorporated into a majority of the sacramental liturgies of Reformation times.

In a somewhat different form than in the Roman Catholic Church, did the Old-Christian celebration of the Sacrament further develop itself in the Eastern Greek Church. Several of these differences and peculiarities have already been alluded to. We now add a brief and comprehensive sketch of the entire proceedure in the celebration of this sacred ordinance, as it is observed by the Christians of the Greek Church at the present day. As a characteristic feature *this* would appear first of all; that among the varied responsive singing the celestial songs of praise are imitated, in that one of the vocal choirs, "in a mystic manner," represents the cherubim, and sings a Tersanctus to the "life bringing Trinity;" secondly, that the symbolism of the Lord's Supper, the representation of the sacrificial death of our Lord, is very strongly emphasized, and is attempted to be realized even in minutest details.

Five "Prospherai," or Communion loaves, are placed upon the altar, all marked with a cruciform seal upon which is written, in Greek: "Jesus Christ has conquered," The celebrant selects one of these as the sacramental lamb, takes it into his left hand, and with the sacred lance, a small, lance-like knife, intended to remind one of the spear, which pierced the side of our Lord—he makes, first of all, the sign of the cross upon the bread, and then pierces an opening on its right side, saying: "He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter;" then on the left side, continuing: "and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth."

Piercing the upper side, he remarks: "he was taken from prison and from judgment;" and the lower side: "who shall declare his generation." Then he cuts into the bread crosswise, and says: "The Lamb of God, which beareth the sins of the world, is offered for the life and salvation of the world." Hereupon the lance is driven into the bread up to the hilt, and this is explained to signify: "One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water. And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true." At the same time the deacon, to render this perceptible, pours wine and *cold* water into the cup, and the bishop consecrates the sacred mixture.

The four remaining loaves are cut up in honor of Mary, the patriarchs and apostles, the saints of the Christian Church, the bishops and priests, and finally of the civil authority, and are placed alongside of the consecrated bread, which alone is used in the communion. Then follows a solemn incensing of the altar, of the various vessels, and of the covered elements, and then the so-called "grand procession of the sacrament," symbolizing Christ on His way to the crucifixion, in which the presbyter with the cup, and the deacon with the bread, preceded by the lighted tapers and the burning incense, make a circuit of the entire assemblage to the very doors of the church and thence return to the bishop at the altar. Then the burial of Christ is also symbolically imitated, in that the bishop solemnly places the bread and the wine upon the linen-covered altar, reciting corresponding passages from the Gospels in connection therewith. Thus the altar is consecrated unto the sepulchre of the Redeemer. "The prayer of presentation," the confession of faith, passages from the Psalms, are then repeated, interspersed with antiphonies by the choir. Thereafter follows the consecration of the elements with passages from Cor. xi., in part softly, in part loudly repeated, accompanied by signs of the cross, manifold consecratory benedictions, and by petitions for the living and the dead. Then the choir sings the Lord's Prayer; the administrating clergymen gird themselves, pray for their purification for the sacred celebration, and begin to commune

by themselves, a curtain being drawn to separate them from the people. The bishop breaks the bread, saying: "The Lamb of God is broken and divided; it is broken and remains undivided; it is forever eaten and never consumed; it sanctifies all that receive it." Then he pours *warm* water into the cup, and says: "The fervor of faith is full of the Holy Ghost. Blessed is the fervor of Thy saints at all times." Hereupon the bishop communes and then imparts the elements to the other clergy, using one of the old church formulas. The clergy having all communed, the curtain is drawn back, and the deacons carry the bread dipped into the wine to the congregation, and with a spoon put the same into the mouth of each communicant. This drawing back of the curtain, behind which the sacred gift appears, symbolizes the appearance of our Lord after His resurrection. The choir then sings: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; the Lord is God and has appeared unto us." No formula of distribution is used in the communion of the laity. The thanksgiving offered at the close of the celebration consisted mainly in the reading of the 34th Psalm.

We now proceed to take up the rites of the sacramental celebration as they were developed in the Churches of the Reformation. Two great fundamental ritual orders are to be distinguished: 1. The one adopted by Luther and Zwingli, having for its basis the canon of the Gregorian Mass, which both of these Reformers permitted to be continued in use in its essential features, purifying and shortening the same, each one however in his own peculiar manner; 2. The one proceeding from Calvin, in which the old order does not appear in any way to be referred to, but rather does the whole of it seem to be formed anew, with the greatest possible simplicity and freedom from all formulæ, so that, in place of solemn ceremonies—in the broadest sense of the term—is found nought but the holy desire for the sacrament in itself. In the Reformed Church, both of these ritual orders, being alike at home, naturally and manifoldly came in contact and commingled with, as well as mutually modified each other. And

through this they led to the great variety of rites which we now find in these churches, since in Reformed Switzerland alone more than six different kinds of sacramental services may be enumerated.

Two orders of service, concerning the Lord's Supper, proceeded from Luther: the one of the year 1523, in which everything (even the language) of the Roman Mass—that did not directly contradict the teachings of the Scriptures, was retained, so that the sacramental celebration consisted of: 1. The Introduction, in the same manner as in the Roman Catholic Mass; 2. The Consecration, with the *Sanctus* and the *Benedictus*, followed by the elevation of the bread and the wine; 3. The Lord's Prayer and the *Pax Domini;* 4. The Distribution of the elements, "which the priest is to give unto himself and unto the people, whilst the *Agnus Dei* is being sung;" 5. The *Benedicamus Domina* and the closing benediction of the priest according to Ps. 67 : 7, 8.

Next, the sacramental order of service of the year 1526: "The German Mass" ("appointed for the sake of the simple-minded laymen:" Walch's Edition of Luther's Works, Vol. x., 266–285). The celebration shall begin with a fixed "Paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer and an Admonition," composed by Luther himself, and to be delivered from the altar or from the pulpit ("it is my wish that this paraphrase be appointed as a prescribed order, for the sake of the people, so that it be impossible for a person to say one thing one day and another thing the next day, for any one to display his art so as to lead the people astray that they can neither learn nor retain anything"): "Dear friends in Christ, since we are here gathered together in the name of the Lord to receive his Holy Testament, I admonish you first of all that ye lift up your hearts unto God, and unite with me in praying: "Our Father," &c. Then the celebrant repeats 1 Cor. 11 : 23, 24, consecrates and distributes the bread first, and *then* he consecrates the wine ("it seems to me to be in keeping with the Sacrament to distribute the bread immediately after its consecration and before consecrating the wine; for thus says Luke and Paul"), presenting it to the communicants whilst the

congregation is singing the "*German Sanctus*," or the hymn "God be praised," or John Huss' hymn, "Jesus Christ our Saviour," or the German "Agnus Dei." "In coming to the table all shall proceed decently and in order, not men and women together, but the women after the men, each sex standing apart by themselves in separate places." After all have communed, there follows a short prayer of thanksgiving ("We thank Thee, Almighty God, that Thou has refreshed us by this saving gift, and implore Thy mercy, that Thou wouldst bless it to the strengthening of our faith toward Thee and to future love among us all, for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord"), and finally the Old Testament benediction. "Moreover the *third* way and correct manner of the Evangelical order," says Luther in this declaration, ought to be this: "That the Sacrament be not so publicly celebrated, among all sorts of people; but rather, that those who would really be Christians, and confess the Gospel in word and in deed, should assemble in a house alone by themselves, to pray, to read, to baptize, to receive the Lord's Supper, and to practice other Christian works. Here then the Communion can be administered in a right orderly manner, and all tend unto the word and prayer and love." "But," adds Luther to this, "I can not and do not wish to establish such a congregation or assembly, for I have not the persons to do it with; and I do not see many that are pressing forward to receive the Sacrament."

The second order of service abovementioned, the "German Mass," was now freely treated and accordingly modified in some respects in one or the other locality, and has become the common sacramental order of service in Evangelical Lutheran churches. This order—to mention but a few of the most important sacramental rituals—is found in the communion service of Brenz (1526), of Braunschweig (1528), of Brandenburg-Nürnberg (1533), of Würtemberg (1536), &c. The differences between the various services refer chiefly to the formula of distribution. Luther, in his "Formula Missae," retained that of the canon of the Roman Mass: "May the body (blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul

unto eternal life." On the other hand, in his "German Mass," as we have seen, no formula of distribution whatever occurs, and nowhere else can it be found that any was appointed by him. His co-laborer, Bugenhagen, did even most decidedly express himself against the use of such a formula ("In distributing the elements nothing should be said to the communicants"), "since the congregation have already heard the words and the command of Christ, which words cannot afterwards be improved upon"*) so that in a large part of the North German Churches—latest of all in Lübeck and Schleswig Holstein, and there until the close of the seventeenth century—the Lord's Supper was celebrated without the individual address to the communicants. Yet gradually, these congregations also followed the otherwise universal Lutheran practice of using a formula of distribution. The first formula, which differed from that of the canon of the mass, closely connected with the words of institution, is found in the sacramental service of the Duchy of Prussia (1525): "Take and eat (drink) this is the body which is given for thee ("the blood that is shed for thee"). Ten years later, in a somewhat more complete exposition of the Brandenburg-Nürnberg order, and in many others: "This is the body of Christ given for thee; this is the blood of the New Testament shed for thy sins." Again in connection with the canon of the mass: the Pomeranian order (1542): "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ given for thee unto death strengthen and preserve thee in the faith unto everlasting life." The service of Hall in Suabia (1543): "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thee unto eternal life. May the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be unto thee a cleansing from all thy sins." The Cologne order (1543): "Take and eat for thy salvation the body of the Christ which is given for thee. Take and drink for thy salvation the blood of the New Testament which is shed for thy sins." From the close of the sixteenth century onward, both of these formulas were brought more and more into

*Compare Kaweran: "Zur Geschichte der lutherischen Spendeformelu." Zeitschrift von Rudelbach und Guericke, 1870, p. 258.

connection with each other, the one, originating from the words of institution, first in order of a confession, the other, proceeding from the canon of the mass, following as a benediction. As a result of the controversies concerning the Lord's Supper, and in order distinctly to emphasize the opposition to the "Sacramentarians," the expressions: "the true body," "the true blood," were added in some localities; until the formula, which is now regarded as the Lutheran one, and which is probably in use among all Lutheran Christian, was developed: "Take and eat (drink), this is the body (blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ, given for you upon the cross (shed for you for the forgiveness of your sins); may it strengthen and preserve you in the true faith unto everlasting life." The communicants were accustomed to respond with a loud: "Amen."

As a distinct peculiarity of the Wurtemberg sacramental order is to be mentioned a special preparatory service, which is to be held on the evening previous to the communion, a usage not elsewhere observed in the Lutheran Church, and evidently due to Swiss influence which affected the Reformation in Wurtemberg, and which custom prevails there to the present day.

Besides the use of the formula of distribution, there are certain features, universally prevalant (in contradistinction to the Reformed) in the Lutheran administration of the Lord's Supper, as follows: the consecration of the elements by the sign of the cross, the use of wafers (unleavened bread), which are *not* broken, of *white* (not red) wine, kneeling in communing, and finally the placing of the sacred elements, not in the hand, but directly in the mouth of the communicants.

More manifold and more widely differing are the forms that occur in the Reformed churches. In one locality the ritual introduced by Zwingli, in another that by Calvin, have maintained themselves; in a third locality both have mingled; in a fourth locality Lutheran influences have been added and have operated in a determining manner. As a universal and characteristic feature may be noticed in general,

that it was desired to retain, as firmly as possible, the character of a feast of communion. The communicants are to not only receive a gift of grace, each for himself,—which might be a common and accidental feature—but rather should they receive, communing with their Lord and Redeemer, seated in His presence at the table prepared by Him, the blessing which the Lord has attached to such a communion with Himself and with the brethren.

From this consideration a two-fold result may be deduced (characteristic of all the purely Reformed, non-Lutheran congregation) for the celebration of the Sacrament: First—concerning which I know of no exception upon the entire territory of the Reformed Churches—the earnest purpose to exclude all those from the Communion, who do not really belong to the Church of Christ, and who do not sincerely long for his life and salvation. To this end there is held on the day preceding every communion a special preparatory service, with very specific liturgical addresses, whose underlying thought is to be found in 1 Cor. 11 : 22, 29, (a few localities in Eastern Switzerland form an exception to this rule). And even at the celebration itself, in part before presenting the sacred emblems, those who remain in their sins are commanded to retire, and unto all is the question addressed: whether they have examined themselves so as not to receive condemnation. In some of the Reformed Churches, the effect has been that none of "the avowed Christians" assemble to commune, whilst the great majority of church members entirely abstain from communning; as *e. g.*, in East Frisia, where the number of communicants is only about five per cent. of the membership. In other localities on the contrary, the general coming to the Communion is not thereby interfered with. Indeed the idea of a congregational supper, and the less frequent celebration of the same, causes every one, that is in the least interested in the Church, to regard it to be his positive duty, as well as a privilege not to be neglected, to partake of the Sacrament.

The second consideration concerning the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which is directly deduced from the Reformed

conception of the Sacrament, (hence not for the same reason that Bugenhagen assigned) is the omission of a formula of distribution addressed to each communicant. For by the use of such a formula the communion clearly becomes an individual matter; each one is addressed and each one partakes as an individual. If, on the other hand, the common or mutual communion is to be maintained, a common address to all is the only natural and appropriate manner. Therefore Zwingli and Calvin omitted the individual formula in the sacramental services proceeding from them. And herein they have been followed, up to the present day, by the greater part of the Reformed Churches of Switzerland, the French, the Dutch, the Scotch, the English Puritan, and by the American Churches proceeding from these. Only in the Reformed Churches of Germany, influenced by the spirit of Melanchthon, such as the Churches of Anhalt, Hesse, East Frisia, the Mark of Brandenburg, Bavaria, the Palatinate, Rhenish Prussia, as well as in the Lutheran-Reformed Swiss Churches of Basel and Schaffenhausen (also in the recently organized Church of Aargau), in the less numerous South-Dutch and Walloon Churches, and, in general, in the peculiarly constituted Anglican Church, a different usage is observed. As the formula of distribution, so far as I can discover, the words of St. Paul are everywhere used: "The bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ: the cup of blessing which we bless, is the communion of the blood of Christ." In Bremen alone the words of institution are added. The Old-Christian address: "May the body (blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thee unto eternal life," is repeated in the Anglican formula of distribution and the one in use at Basel. In the former it is enlarged by the addition: "Take and eat in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed upon him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving; in the latter: "The dying of the body (the shedding of the blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ strengthen and preserve thee unto eternal life."

According to the original Zwinglian order, closely following the canon of the mass, the sacramental celebration is ar-

ranged as follows: it begins with a short introductory prayer, and then proceeds at once, like the Lutheran order, to the reading of the corresponding passages from Cor. xi., whereupon there follows a responsive service, between the minister and his assistant (deacon), between the clergy and the laity, the whole of which is taken from the Gregorian canon. With this is connected the reading of the passages from John vi., that speak of the feeding of the soul by means of the flesh and the blood of the Lord, the recitation of the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and another short prayer. Whilst the celebrant again reads the words: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the night in which He was betrayed," &c., the bread is broken and with the cup is carried to the congregation seated in the church. A loaf of bread, *i. e.* a large wafer, is passed along each pew, from which wafer every communicant breaks a small piece. The fragments that remain are gathered together by the deacons at the other end of the pews. In the same way every pew receives a cup that passes from hand to hand. The cups, of which so large a number is used, are of wood. When all have eaten and drank in this manner, there is read, as a thanksgiving, the 103d Psalm, somewhat modified and enriched by passages from Isaiah, and finally a closing admonition with the Benediction.

According to the Calvinistic liturgy, the celebration begins with a short prayer, followed by a long address to the believers, in which, first of all the eleventh chapter of 1 Corinth. is read, and then with serious earnestness the reverence and sincerity, with which the sacred supper is to be received, are emphasized, concerning whose nature and significance very specific instruction is imparted. Then follows a short prayer of thanksgiving for the gift of the only begotten Son, the only part of this liturgy that is related to the Old-Christian order. Then the minister takes the bread, several members of the Consistory the cup, and present the same to the communicants, who have approached the table, without any further address or formula of distribution. Instead of this, during the entire celebration, Scripture passages are read

from the pulpit, which refer to and explain the Sacrament.* The service closes with a short prayer of thanksgiving and the Benediction.

Surpassing Calvin in Calvinistic freedom and simplicity, is the method of procedure in France and Scotland, where everything distinctly liturgical is wanting, and all is conducted with extemporaneous address and prayer. The communicants assemble around a table in separate companies, and present to one another the sacred emblems. At the head of a large table, covered with white linen, upon which two cups and two silver patens with bread are placed, stands the administrating clergyman of the Reformed Church, in Paris. Those nearest—about 25 or 30—without distinction as to sex, approach and range themselves about the table. The minister then offers an extemporaneous prayer, recites the words of institution and gives to his neighbor, right and left, first one of the patens and then one of the cups, which now pass from hand to hand, each one helping himself to the same. That finished, the minister returns thanks again in an extemporaneous prayer. Those who have communed, now retire, and another company takes their place. In a similar manner among the Scotch Presbyterians, with this exception, that here—at least in the larger congregations—there are always several tables, and that the communicants are assembled sitting and not standing, men and women together. Those who administer the elements are usually presbyters, or at any rate pious and respectable men, members of the congregation. The clergyman occupies a place beneath the pulpit, in the middle of the church, and delivers a sermon, which for the most part, treats of other matters and not of the Lord's Supper. In large congregations, when the celebration may occupy two or three hours, the several ministers of the church relieve each other in the performance of this duty.

In the Reformed Church of Holland, more decidedly than

*In recent times this has been modified in all the Reformed churches of French Switzerland, so that the administrating clergyman addresses the communicants with Scripture passages of his own selection.

anywhere else, the representation of a real supper is retained in the celebration of the Holy Communion. Even the arrangement of the tables is attended to, in the presence of the congregation, at the close of the preceding divine service. The vessels that are used, bowls and tumblers, remind one of ordinary dishes used at table. During the entire celebration, as in the Old-Genevan Church, Scripture passages are read from the pulpit.

Among all the Protestant rituals of the sacramental service, the order of the Anglican Church comes nearest to that of the primitive Christian service of the first centuries. The celebration begins with a general admonition, which recalls the meaning of the Sacrament and warns of the danger of an unworthy participation, and is followed by confession of sin, the congregation kneeling. Then comes the absolution and the invitation to the Holy Supper with the Scripture passages: Matt. 11 : 28; John 3 : 16; 1 Tim. 1 : 15; 1 John 2 : 1. This is followed by the introduction proper and the responses of the congregation ("Lift up your hearts!"—"We lift them up unto the Lord." "Let us give thanks unto the Lord our God."—"It is meet and right so to do," &c.), and the Tersanctus just as in all the Old-Christian liturgies. An appeal to the mercy of God in Christ (which alone can make us worthy to appear in the right frame of mind at this wonderful table of grace), together with the prayer of institution and the recital of the corresponding passage from 1 Cor. xi., leads to the celebration itself. First of all the minister himself partakes of the bread and the wine, and then offers both to the kneeling communicants, placing the elements into their hands whilst he recites the above given formula of distribution. When all have communed, the Lord's Prayer is repeated, the congregation joining audibly in every petition. Then a prayer of thanksgiving is offered, and finally the *Gloria in Excelsis* (a very beautiful song of praise, composed of the angelic chorus and of the *Agnus Dei*) is sung. The consecrated bread and wine must not be preserved, nor carried out of the church; the minister, in company with other communicants invited for that purpose, must eat and

drink, in a reverential manner, that which remains of the bread and the wine, directly after the Benediction.

The character of the ritual of the sacramental service of the United Church (of Prussia) corresponds to a fusion of the Lutheran and Reformed rituals. According to the Prussian liturgy of the year 1822, which may be regarded as the model Union liturgy, the sacramental service begins—rather after the Reformed way—with an admonition to the communicants, containing at its close, a warning against an unworthy participation. It then passes, after a short prayer following—the Lutheran way—to the consecration of the elements (the congregation kneeling). After the bestowal of the Old-Christian greeting of peace, the distribution of the elements follows, the two wafers that are baked together being broken asunder, the formula, so manifoldly attacked and justified, being repeated: "Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, says: 'This is my body,'" &c. A short prayer of thanksgiving, the benediction, and the singing of the apostolic greeting, close the sacramental celebration.

Of the smaller evangelical denominations, the *Quakers* do not celebrate the Lord's Supper at all. The ritual of the other principal Anglo-American dissenters (Baptists and Methodists) do not present anything special, being throughout after the old Calvinistic order.

On the other hand, the sacramental service of the German United Brethren possesses many a peculiar feature, worthy of mention. Every month, usually on Saturday, and moreover in the evening, the Lord's Supper is celebrated, having been preceded during the course of the week by a preparatory sermon. The minister and the assisting deacons appear robed in white surplices. After the singing of a few verses and a prayer of absolution (kneeling), there follows the consecration of the bread by reciting the words of institution. The consecrated bread is then distributed to the communicants and retained in the hand until all are provided therewith. This being finished, the singing (which accompanies the distribution) ceases, the congregation arises, the minister speaks: "Eat, this is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ,

given for us unto death." All now kneel together and partake of the consecrated element. After the singing of a few more stanzas, the cup is consecrated and then carried by the deacons to the communicants, received by them standing, and passed along from one to the other. No prayer is further offered. The congregation sings a hymn. On the following day (Sunday) the solemn liturgy of thanksgiving is offered.

Concerning, finally, the definite time for the celebration of the communion, the Lutheran Church sets up the ideal demand, that such should take place every Sunday at the close of divine service, so that "the table of the Lord should always be prepared in His church, and should never want for guests." But practically this can not well be carried out. And whilst in some localities the Holy Supper *may* be celebrated upon every Sunday (if communicants are at hand), yet in other places definite times are appointed for its celebration: as a rule, upon one Sunday of each month and on the three great festivals. Calvin likewise desired a monthly celebration, but did not succeed in realizing it; so that, in by far the greater portion of that Church, the rule is a quarterly communion on Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, and one Sunday in the month of September. An exception to this rule, is *e. g.* Basel, where, besides the general celebration on the above named days, the Sacrament is administered on every Sunday in one of the four principal churches of that city.

For further information concerning this subject consult: Augusti, "Denkwürdigkeiten der Christlichen Kirche;" Alt, "Der kirchliche Gottesdienst" (Berlin 1851); Gieseler's, Kirchengeschichte;" Ebrard, "Geschichte des Dogmas vom heiligen Abendmahl;" Rüchert, "Das heilige Abendmahl;" Richter, "Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen."

ARTICLE VI.

SKETCH OF MUHLENBERG MISSION, AFRICA.

By Rev. J. A. Clutz, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

The name of Rev. Morris Officer, of precious memory, is no less inseparably connected with the founding and early history of Muhlenberg Mission, than that of "Father Heyer" is with our India Mission. To him belongs the honor, under God, of originating the project of establishing a Lutheran Mission on the West Coast of Africa, and the successful execution of the project is due mainly to his energy, and wisdom and devotion to the cause. How early in his religious experience his mind was first directed to the subject of Foreign Missions, it is impossible for us now to tell, but it is spoken of among the first entries in his diary, as a matter which had already been long and prayerfully considered. And from the very first his heart seems to have been drawn towards Africa, as the country in which mission work was most needed. His first public effort to arouse the interest of the Church seems to have been made by the insertion of the following brief paragraph in the *Lutheran Observer*.

An Answer Wanted.—It has long been a subject of thought in the minds of *some* members of the Lutheran Church whether we should not have a mission in Africa. The hearts of some *feel* in reference to it, and they desire to have the opinion of their more wise and experienced fathers and brethren. Many words need not be used. We earnestly ask, *Is the Lutheran Church able and willing to furnish the men and the means to establish a mission in Africa? or, if suitable and willing men can be found, will the Church send and support them?"* INQUIRER.

This inquiry appeared in the *Observer* of July 18th, 1851, accompanied by the following editorial comment:

"Africa.—A correspondent inquires whether the Lutheran

Church is willing and prepared to establish a mission in Africa? He tells us that if the pecuniary means can be procured there are men in the Church ready to go forth as missionaries. We have not time now to enlarge on this subject, but would be glad to hear from others on it."

In the *Observer* of September 5th, of the same year, the editor, Dr. Kurtz, makes more extended mention of the subject, in connection with a letter from Rev. G. H. N. Peters, in which it is stated that Bro. Officer and a Mr. Summers, then a student at Wittenberg College, were ready and willing to go to Africa as soon as the Church would send them.

About the same time, Mr. Officer had the matter brought to the attention of the Wittenberg Synod at its meeting in Bucyrus, O., where he was also set apart to the gospel ministry. None of his efforts seem, however, to have met with much encouragement, and a less determined or less devoted man would probably have given up the enterprise in despair. Even Mr. Officer with all his zeal seems to have felt that it would be impossible at that time to excite sufficient interest in the Church to enable him to carry out his plan of establishing a Lutheran Mission at once, and therefore in the winter of 1851–52 he tendered his services to the American Missionary Society of New York, which had established a mission at Kaw Mendi, on the Little Boom River, some ten years before. The offer was gladly accepted, and on the 25th of December, 1852 he sailed from New York, in company with several other missionaries. They arrived at their destination on the West coast on the 5th of February following, and Bro. Officer was soon at work with the rest, teaching, preaching, and doing general mission work as he had opportunity. Their efforts, however, were very much interrupted by a war which was in progress among several of the adjoining tribes. They met also with many other discouragements, so that but little was accomplished, and in August of the same year, Mr. Officer went to Monrovia, in the Republic of Liberia, still having in view the possibility of some day founding a Lutheran Mission among these people, whose degradation and need moved him so deeply. He remained in

and about Monrovia for several weeks, visiting the settlements, preaching in the churches, and gathering all possible information concerning the best methods and location for successful mission work. During this time he visited the place which he afterwards selected as the site of Muhlenberg mission. In October he returned to Mendi, where he labored as faithfully as the condition of his health would allow until the Spring of 1854, when he returned to America, arriving in New York, July 24th.

His experience and observation in Africa seem only to have strengthened his desire and purpose to organize a Lutheran Mission in that benighted land, and he at once gave himself to the task of trying to awaken the Church to the importance of the work. In 1855 he published a pamphlet of 24 pages, entitled, "A Plea for a Lutheran Mission in Liberia," which was republished in the *Lutheran Observer*. In this "Plea," he presents a very clear and satisfactory account of the West coast of Africa, and of the religion, politics, social and domestic condition, superstitions, arts, &c., of its inhabitants.

At the close of this "Plea," Mr. Officer presents a plan for the establishment of a Lutheran Mission in Liberia," which was afterwards adopted with some modifications, when the mission was finally undertaken.

In 1856 he published a second pamphlet of about forty pages entitled, "Western Africa, A Mission Field," in which he repeats substantially the facts contained in his "Plea," with some additional statements.

In the meantime, at the meeting of the General Synod, held at Dayton, Ohio, in June, 1855, the first official steps were taken towards the accomplishment of the results for which Bro. Officer had been so long laboring and praying. In response to a memorial from the Miami Synod recommending the establishment of a Lutheran Mission in Liberia on the plan suggested in the "Plea" spoken of above, a committee was appointed to take the matter into consideration. This committee subsequently reported favorably, recognizing the claims of the African field, and recommending the ap-

pointment of a comittee of five, who should have charge of the preliminary work, and be authorized to employ some competent person to superintend the preparatory arrangements, mature plans, &c. This report was adopted and may be found in the minutes of 1855, page 23. Revs. S. Sprecher, S. W. Harkey, W. H. Harrison, J. D. Martin, and F. Gebhart were appointed on this committee of arrangements. From their report, presented at the next meeting of the General Synod at Reading, in May, 1857, it appears that on the 12th of December, 1855, they had appointed Rev. M. Officer, Superintendent of the enterprise, with instructions to travel through the Church and collect funds for the founding of a Home School, or Mission Institute, in which people of color might be educated and prepared for work as missionaries in the African field. As the result of his efforts, about $1000 had been collected, clear of expenses, and some $400 more subscribed. They also present, in their report, a plan for the conducting of the mission in Africa, which is substantially the same as that proposed by Mr. Officer in his "Plea."

At the meeting of the General Synod at Pittsburg, in 1859, this committee was continued, with instructions to proceed with the work, but not to take any important step without the co-operation of the Executive Committee of the Foreign Missionary Society. It was then determined by the joint Committee to found a Mission School at Reading, but this project seems never to have been carried out. They also resolved to send Bro. Officer to Africa in the Fall of the same year, 1859, to select a suitable place for the location of the proposed mission, and superintend its establishment, and in September Mr. H. Heigerd was appointed to accompany and assist him.

These two brethren, after a number of very trying delays, sailed from Baltimore, Md., February 23d, 1860, and arrived at Liberia on the 5th of April following. A suitable place for the location of the Mission was at once selected, not, however, without much pains and many prayers. The location fixed on and still occupied by the Mission is a high bluff on

the St. Paul's River, about thirty miles from Monrovia, the capital of Liberia. The wisdom of the selection has been attested by all who have visited the Mission, whether our own missionaries or the representatives of other denominations. The location is high, and as healthy as can be found without going much farther into the interior. It is at the head of navigation on the St. Paul's River, a stream of about the size and volume of the Susquehanna, and at a crossing of several of the most frequented roads, or paths, used by the interior tribes in passing to and from the coast. The ground is exceedingly fertile, and sufficiently rolling to afford excellent drainage. There is a fine brook running through the Mission farm, and a never failing spring of most excellent water near the Mission buildings. Bro. Day, the present missionary, says he does not think a better or more healthful location could possibly have been found anywhere on the coast, and that he certainly believes that Mr. Officer was directed to the selection of this site by divine aid.

After having fixed upon the location for the Mission, Bro. Officer visited the President of the Republic, and on application readily secured a grant of 100 acres of land for a Mission farm, and 200 acres more, to be held in reserve for future settlers around the Mission. Suitable buildings were then erected, and shortly after they received 40 children, 20 boys and 20 girls, from a large number of recaptured slaves, who had been landed at Monrovia. These children were indentured to the mission by the Liberian government, and named after well known men and women in the Church in America, and with them the missionaries began their work. And so, after nine years of patient, prayerful, persistent effort from the time that his first inquiry on the subject appeared in the *Lutheran Observer* of July, the 18th, 1851, Bro. Officer found himself at work in Africa, in a Lutheran Mission. How his heart must have rejoiced in his success, notwithstanding the numerous discouragements, and almost insurmountable difficulties with which he had met!

The children rapidly improved under their care, and some

of these same boys and girls have since become very excellent Christian men and women, and have been very useful at the Mission.

In August of the same year, a Miss Kilpatrick, who had been for some time engaged in teaching in Liberia, was employed as a teacher in the Mission. This lady subsequently became the wife of Mr. Heigerd, and proved a most valuable assistant in the work of organizing and carrying on the Mission.

On February the 17th, 1861, a church was organized, consisting of seven or eight members including Mr. and Mrs. Heigerd, the others being colored people. This was a glad day in the newly established mission.

In April, of 1861, Mr. Officer returned to America, in accordance with the original plan, to superintend the interests of the mission at home, leaving Mr. and Mrs. Heigerd to conduct the work in Africa.

At the meeting of the General Synod, held at Lancaster, Pa., in May 1862, the Mission was transferred entirely into the hands of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions, and the special committee was discharged. At the same time Mr. B. F. Steiner, a student at Wittenberg College, was appointed to proceed to Africa in the coming Fall to assist Mr. Heigerd. This brother, however, felt called, at the time of our national peril, to give his services to his country, and was mortally wounded on the field of Gettysburg, on the 1st of July, 1863, while bravely fighting at the head of his company.

In place of Mr. Steiner, Rev. John Kistler came forward and offered his services to the committee. He was ordained to the ministry by a special committee at Newport, Perry Co., Pa., April 28th, 1863, and sailed from Baltimore on the 16th of May following, arriving at Muhlenberg some time in August. This timely reinforcement very much encouraged the hearts of Mr. and Mrs. Heigerd, both of whom had been suffering very much from the fever. The latter failed so rapidly that she was obliged to leave her husband at the Mission and return to America in the beginning of October,

1863. In the Spring of 1864, Mr. Heigerd's health became so bad that his only hope for recovery was in returning at once to the United States. He made all his preparations to do so, and had already engaged his passage in a vessel about to sail, when his health suddenly improved so much that this devoted man of God felt constrained to remain and continue his labors among the poor Africans.

Soon after this, on June 28th, a very important event in the history of the mission transpired. This was nothing less than the first Christian marriage of natives connected with the mission. Four couples, consisting respectively of Charles A. Hay and Georgianna Morris, Chas. P. Krauth and Ann Turner, Wm. A. Passavant and Catharine Luther, and John D. Martin and Clara Heilig, presented themselves in the Mission Chapel and were duly joined in holy wedlock in the presence of the assembled congregation. "In the evening of the same day," says the letter in the *Observer*, from which this account is taken, "the four married couples removed their meagre supply of personal effects to their respective homes, made ready to receive them, and there took up their abodes. And those of their former companions, who accompanied them, say, that when they entered their new homes, they knelt down and prayed." And thus was laid the foundation of the Christian settlement which still exists in the neighborhood of the mission, and is constantly growing by accessions from the mission. It was like the leaven hid in the three measures of meal, but like the leaven also it is slowly but surely working, and will no doubt eventually become one of the most powerful and effective agencies for the social and spiritual regeneration of Africa.

The 3d of July of the same year, was also a day of special and solemn interest at the mission. It was the holy Sabbath, and in connection with the administration of the Lord's Supper, eight new members were received into the little church, by the solemn rite of Christian baptism. These were the first-fruits of missionary effort at Muhlenberg, and must have greatly cheered the hearts of the devoted little

band of workers, as they thus saw that their labors were "not in vain in the Lord."

In June of this year, 1864, Rev. John M. Rice and wife, accompanied by the wife and child of Mr. Kistler, sailed for Africa, arriving at Muhlenberg on the 28th of July, and bringing a much needed reinforcement to the strength of the mission.

Soon after their arrival, Mr. Heigerd, whose health had again failed, was obliged to leave for America.

Neither Mr. Rice nor his wife seemed able to stand the climate, and after a great deal of sickness and suffering, they were obliged to return to the United States in less than a year from their arrival.

Although at first, Mr. Kistler seemed to suffer but little, during the summer of 1865 both he and his wife were greatly afflicted, and in the following Winter they were obliged to take a short sea-voyage for the recovery of their health. They returned from this apparently very much benefited, but the improvement was only temporary, and in the Fall of 1866, Mrs. Kistler died, the first of our missionaries to Africa whose devotion was sealed by the sacrifice of life. Mr. Kistler's health also continued to fail, and he was obliged to come home early in the following year.

On the return of Bro. Kistler, Rev. Henry Heigerd was appointed to take charge of the mission, but after careful consideration, he declined the appointment. The mission was thus left without any white missionary in charge, and remained in this condition for nearly two years. It was partly served, however, during this time, by a Mr. Kelley an American negro, who had emigrated to Liberia some years before, and was a layman in the Methodist Church. Mr. Kelley, exercised a general supervision over the mission work, took care of the mission property, and addressed the congregation once on each Sabbath.

At the meeting of the General Synod in Harrisburg, Pa., in 1868, Mr. Albert Bridges, a colored man of fine parts and great promise, who had been brought to America from the mission in Africa, was received under the care of the Execu-

tive Committee, and sent to Selinsgrove, Pa., to be educated for missionary work. After pursuing his studies for some three years, and when nearly ready to return to his native land to labor among his countrymen, he was suddenly cut off by death, to the great sorrow and disappointment of all interested in the work.

In the meantime, numerous earnest appeals had been made for laborers to occupy this vacant field, but no one seemed ready to go and brave the dangers of that inhospitable climate, which had hitherto proved so injurious to all who had tried it. At last, however, the call was responded to by Rev. Simon P. Carnell, a member of the Middle class in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, who came forward and gave himself cheerfully and heartily to the work. He sailed from New York, Jan. 25th, 1869, and arrived at Monrovia on the the 14th of March following. For a little over a year he labored faithfully and successfully in this most difficult of all missionary fields, and most encouraging reports were coming in both as to his health and the condition and prospects of the mission, when he was seized with a sudden attack of the fever, brought on by indiscreet exposure to the heat through his devotion to the work, and on the 4th of May, 1870, he died and was laid away in the little mission grave-yard to await a glorious resurrection in the last great day. Thus this interesting field was again left without a missionary, and again the call came from that distant land, "Come over and help us." This call was not responded to for some three years, during which time Mr. Kelley was again appointed temporary superintendent of the mission and rendered very efficient service.

In 1873, Rev. J. G. Breuninger and wife of Grantsville, Md., offered their services to the Board, and sailed for Africa on the 26th of May, but in less than a year Mrs. Breuninger fell a victim to the terrible fever which every one going to Africa must pass through in the process of acclimation, and which proves fatal to so many. Her remains were laid by the side of those of Mrs. Kistler and Bro. Carnell and her husband was granted permission to return.

Their place was supplied shortly after by the Rev. David A. Day, a graduate of the Theological Department of the Missionary Institute at Selinsgrove, Pa., who went forth with his young and amiable wife, to stand in the face of peril and help fulfill the command of Christ to his Church to preach the Gospel to every creature. Bro. Day and his wife seem to be peculiarly adapted to this difficult field, and have suffered less from the fever than any others of the missionaries who have been sent out. It is now about five years since they first went to Africa, and still their health does not seem to have been materially impaired, and they both bid fair to serve the Church at Muhlenberg for yet many years. They have been called, however, to lay away in the mission graveyard two sweet babes as the victims of the terrible fever, and in this sore bereavement they will have, as they deserve, the sympathy and prayers of the whole Church. These faithful and devoted missionaries have been twice granted leave of absence by the Board, in order that they might return to America for a few weeks to recruit, and to this wise action of the Board is no doubt to be attributed, at least in part, the fact that they have been able to remain at Muhlenberg so much longer than others. The first time they returned to America was in 1876; and the second in 1879, both of them being in the United States at the present time. They expect to go back to their chosen field of labor in the early Summer, and seem very hopeful as to the future.

Since Bro. Day and his wife first went to Africa, three other missionaries have been sent out, none of whom were able to remain any length of time. Rev. B. B. Collins, a graduate of the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, and his newly married wife sailed for Liberia in September, 1875. They reached the mission in safety in November following, and at once entered upon their work with great zeal and hopefulness. But in a short time Mr. Collins was stricken down with the fever, and a little later his wife, weakened by her unremitting care for her husband, was taken down with the same terrible disease. The attack upon both was so severe, and their condition so dangerous, that it was deemed

best for them to return to the United States by the first ship. They consequently re-embarked for America in April, 1876. The health of Mr. Collins seemed very much improved by the voyage, but his wife was too weak to recover, and after having been at sea about a week, she died, and was buried in mid-ocean, there to rest until that day when the sea shall give up its dead to be judged by him who sitteth on the throne.

In the Summer of 1877, Mr. Herman Voss, a young German, of most excellent character and devoted spirit, was sent out by the Board, as an assistant to Bro. Day, but he too proved unable to stand the climate, and after a few months of service, during the greater part of which time he suffered most severely from the fever, he was granted permission to return.

The following table will show in more condensed form the number of missionaries who have labored in this field, the date of their arrival at Muhlenberg, and the length of time they remained:

Rev. Morris Officer,	arrived in	April,	1860.	Returned in	April,	1861.
Rev. H. Heigerd,	"	"	" 1860.	"	"	Aug. 1864.
Miss Kilpatrick, subsequently						
Mrs. Heigerd,	joined the Mission	Aug.	1860.	"	"	Oct. 1863.
Rev. John Kistler,	arrived in	August	1863.	"	"	1867.
Mrs. Kistler,	"	"	July, 1864.	Died	"	1866.
Rev. J. M. Rice,	"	"	" 1864.	Returned in		1865.
Mrs. Rice,	"	"	" 1864.	"	"	1865.
Rev. S. P. Carnell,	"	"	Mar. 1869.	Died	"	May, 1870.
Rev. J. G. Breuninger,		"	July, 1873.	Returned	"	1874.
Mrs. Breuninger,	"	"	July, 1873.	Died	"	1874.
Rev. D. A. Day,	"	"	1874.			
Mrs Day,	"	"	1874.			
Rev. B. B. Collins,	"	"	Nov. 1875.	Returned in	April,	1876.
Mrs. Collins,	"	"	Nov. 1875.	Died on return voyage in April		1876.
Mr. Herman Voss,	"	"	July, 1877.	Returned in,		1878.

From this table it will be seen that from the beginning of the Mission in 1861, to the present time, a period of 18 years, 15 missionaries have been employed by the Board in the African Mission. Of this number, 3 have died at the mis-

sion and 1 on the way home; 9 have returned with their health more or less shattered, and only 2 remain. It should be said, however, that of those who have returned, nearly all and perhaps all have been able, after a short season of rest, to resume pastoral, or other labor.

Having presented this hasty sketch of the founding and history of Muhlenberg Mission, it may now very justly be asked, What are the results of all this expenditure of time, and money, and labor, and even life? In trying to answer this question, it must be remembered, however, that it is exceedingly difficult, and it might be said impossible, to sum up the results of Foreign Mission work in any satisfactory way, or indeed, in any way that will give a very clear idea of what has been accomplished. A very large part of the missionary's work is incidental and indirect, and it may be years before the results can be summed up or even begin to appear. And yet none of this work is in vain, and to judge the whole work by its direct and immediately visible results would be manifestly most unjust. These direct results, however, are the only ones which can be presented in a paper like this. And though they are by no means what either the missionaries or the Board would wish to see, they are still such as to furnish us much encouragement from the past, and excite no small hope for the future.

To be brief, then, we have, in the first place a well established mission, which is regarded as a model in all its appointments and plans for work, by all other denominations having missions on the West coast, or contemplating the founding of any. The location, of which I have already spoken, is acknowledged by all to be most excellent, both as regards climate, and facilities for mission work. The buildings are now in excellent condition, having been recently renewed, and constructed of hard wood, at a considerable expense. They consist of a two-story dwelling house, twenty-six feet square, a two-story children's house, forty by twenty feet, used for chapel, school and dormitory purposes, and a one-and a-half story building, twenty feet long by ten in width, used for kitchen and storing purposes. These buildings, with the

addition of a small chapel for church and school purposes, which the missionary has been authorized to erect on his return, will be sufficient for all the uses of the mission for many years to come.

We have also a farm of nearly 75 acres under cultivation, on which all the vegetables used in the mission are raised. A large part of this farm is planted with coffee trees, of which 18,000 are growing finely. About half of these are already bearing, and when they all come into full bearing, as they will in five or six years, this farm will be quite valuable and the proceeds from it will very nearly make the mission self-sustaining. The yield the last season was about 1250 pounds, which brought 20 cents per pound in gold, at the mission.

In the mission school we have at present 62 children, ranging in their ages from 5 to 18 and 25 years. Nine of these are girls. They are all indentured to the mission, and are under our complete control until they become of age. They are instructed in all the elementary branches of an English education, and receive careful bible teaching and training, and many of them give evidence of being sincere and devout Christians. As they grow up, some of them are employed in various capacities in the mission, others marry and settle about the mission, receiving 5 acres each of the land granted to the mission by the President of Liberia and reserved for that purpose. There are now about 40 Christian families settled around the mission in this way, forming the nucleus of a Christian community, and exerting a most excellent influence on their countrymen, who see in their thrift, and comfort, and habits of life an illustration of the blessings of our holy religion. Still others of these children, on becoming free, go back to their tribes. Some of these have been followed up by the missionary and found living consistent Christian lives. Others have been lost sight of, and no doubt some have gone back to the religion and customs of their people. But even in these cases they will carry some good impressions with them from the mission, and will at

least prepare the way for future missionary efforts among the tribes to which they belong.

There are also about 25 day scholars in attendance at the school, some of them being the children of the Christian families spoken of above, and some of them the children of heathen parents, living near the mission. I may say here that there are about a hundred native men from various tribes, who with their families spend at least a part of their time in the neighborhood of the mission. These are about half-civilized, and most of them belong to the better class of natives, many of them being chiefs, or the sons of chiefs. Though still heathen, they attend most of the church services at the mission, send their children to the mission school, and are warm friends of the missionary. Indeed they might almost be called his body-guard, for it is on these that he depends for his safety, or calls for help if he wants any special service rendered. They give him a prestige also among all the tribes, so that he can generally travel anywhere in the interior without any fear of molestation.

The Church that was organized twenty-eight years ago with a native membership of only five or six, has now a native membership of fifty-five. Among these is quite a number who according to the missionary's accounts, would do credit, in point of experimental and practical piety, to any of our home churches.

These are *some* of the results of our African work. It is true that they seem small. Yet, when we remember that the greater part of the time there has been but one missionary on the ground, that most of those who have gone out have been compelled to return within a year or two, and that during a considerable part of its history the mission had no white missionary there at all, we must wonder that so much has been accomplished rather than so little. It is to be remembered also that the mission is comparatively young yet, and that all mission work among a heathen, and especially among an almost wholly uncivilized people, must be exceedingly slow. Many years must necessarily be consumed in foundation work, and we are really now just beginning to reap the

fruits of the faithful labors of Officer, and Heigerd, and Kistler, and the other earlier missionaries.

I will only say yet in conclusion, that the prospects are much brighter for the future. In a few years we will have at Muhlenberg a full staff of native workers, teachers, preachers, laborers, &c., all of whom will have been trained up in the mission from childhood, and thoroughly grounded in the principles and practice of the Christian religion and morality. Already several of the mission boys have been employed as assistants, and have been found very efficient. Others are being prepared for the work. One, James A. Brown, has been in the family of one of the Professors at Selinsgrove for several years, where he has made commendable progress. He will return to Africa with Bro. Day in a few weeks. Another, Harry Pohlman, has been at school in Monrovia for a year past and promises to become a very useful helper. Still others are being trained in the higher branches at the mission. And so it is hoped that in a few years the natives will be able to conduct the mission themselves, or at least with only an occasional visit from a white missionary or superintendent. During the present visit of Mr. and Mrs. Day to America, the mission has been left, for the first time in its history, wholly in the charge of native Christians.

There are fine prospects also, that we will soon be able to extend our work into the interior. Many of the tribes are clamoring for schools and teachers, and Bro. Day informs us that if we had the men, and the means to support them, we could now open at least a hundred of these schools in the interior, every one of which would eventually become a centre of Christian and civilizing influences, such as Muhlenberg now is. May God speed the day when the Church at home will wake up to a due sense of its responsibility and be ready to enter all these open doors of usefulness which God, in His providence, is setting before us in this hitherto benighted land.

ARTICLE VII.

GENERAL SYNOD.

It has been the custom of this REVIEW to give some account of the meetings of the General Synod. The recent meeting does not furnish much of special interest for review, not that the meeting lacked in any wise in interest or importance, but because there was little proposed or done that was new. The meeting was one of great harmony, and indicated progress in the right direction. A brief statement, as much for future reference as for present information, is all that will be attempted.

The twenty-ninth Convention of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, was held in the city of Wooster, Ohio, extending from the 11th to the 18th of June, 1879. The Synod was very cordially received and hospitably entertained by the Lutheran congregation and the citizens of Wooster. The city of Wooster, besides its other attractions in the midst of a rich agricultural district of Ohio, and the general air of enterprise and thrift, is the seat of the University of Wooster, one of the leading Institutions of the Presbyterian Church in the West. Its Commencement occurred during the sessions of the General Synod, and afforded an opportunity to see and hear what others are doing in the great work of Christian education. It was pleasant to find the most cordial feeling between the churches in Wooster. The new Church in the process of erection by Dr. Wiles' congregation, and which it is said will be the finest church edifice in Wooster, was not completed, and the meetings of the General Synod were held in the old church. The new one, however, was so far forward as to admit of holding the Sabbath morning service, including the communion, in the building, with pulpit, pews, etc., temporarily arranged. Dr. Wiles is to be congratulated on his success and prospects in

Wooster. He has at least some of the apostolic requirements of a true bishop—"a good report of them which are without."

In the absence of the President—an absence on many accounts greatly to be regretted—the opening sermon was preached by the Secretary, Dr. S. A. Ort, of New York, from Luke 14 : 16, 17, and John 1 : 42. The subject was: *The practical spirit of the Gospel the distinguishing trait of the General Synod.* The sermon was preached at 10 A. M., June 11th, and at 2 P. M. the Synod was organized by the election of W. D. Strobel, D. D., of Rhinebeck, N. Y., as President; Rev. Prof. J. W. Richard, Carthage, Ill., as Secretary; and Alexander Gebhart, Esq., of Dayton, Ohio, as Treasurer. Rev. J. Croll Baum, of Trenton, N. J., was appointed assistant Secretary. Dr. Strobel's age and venerable appearance imparted a solemn dignity, as well as characteristic grace to his occupancy of the chair. It was a suitable recognition of his long service and devotion to the Church of his fathers. The number of District Synods now in the General Synod is twenty-four, one being received at this meeting. The full delegation was little short of 200: the actual attendance of delegates and visitors, including members of Boards, was, we presume considerably above that number, making it one of the largest meetings of the General Synod ever held. In harmony with the sentiments of the opening sermon, the business of the General Synod was eminently of a practical character. Perhaps at no meeting of this body was so little time given to matters of controversy, or topics upon which the sentiment of the Church has been divided.

Foreign Missions is justly allowed the very first place in the business of the General Synod, and the report was most gratifying. Besides the report itself being a model in clearness and completeness, it presented abundant evidence of a healthy and vigorous growth in the work of Foreign Missions. The receipts for the two years have been considerably in advance of any preceding like time, amounting to $38,-938.55 and the addition to the membership even proportionately larger. The report says: "The year 1878 has been the most fruitful year in the history of the Mission. The net

gain in the membership of the mission churches, including old and young, for this one year, has been 1191, being an increase of a fraction over 33 per cent. to our native Christian membership. The whole number of baptized natives in India is now placed at 4,731, of whom 2,086 are adults and regular communicants, the rest being children. There are also 813 candidates for baptism." This refers to the mission in India. A corresponding progress is reported in the African mission. Never before was the work in the foreign field so encouraging and so hopeful.

Home Missions did not present so gratifying a showing. Some progress was claimed as compared with the report two years ago, but the receipts and work accomplished are considerably less than reported at Baltimore in 1875. The receipts, including bequests, have been only $25,686.82, which is very small compared with the field or the ability of the Church. There is a painful lack of interest and vigor in our Home Missionary work. It occupied more time and attention than any other subject before the General Synod, and a change in the entire management was urged, but after a lengthy discussion, the old Board was reappointed. It is earnestly hoped by all parties, that the discussions at Wooster will give a new impetus to this department of our Church work. The Church imperatively demands an advance, and those who manage its affairs dare not disregard the call.

Women's Missionary Societies received full attention, and much is hoped for from the interest awakened in this direction. Some fears were entertained of a disposition to independent action, but the judgment of all seemed to harmonize in the view, that the work of missions, Home and Foreign, should be carried on through the recognized Boards, and that all Societies formed should be simply auxiliary. It is hoped and believed that the influence of earnest devoted women will be felt in various ways in advancing the cause of Missions.

The Publication Society presented a very gratifying report. The management of the Society has undergone important changes, and if we may judge from the report at Wooster a

new era has dawned upon our Publication interests. It is too soon to speak with too much assurance. Time will test the success of the present management, but it is due to say that by far the most encouraging showing for years was that presented at Wooster. The Publication House of the General Synod should receive the support of the Church.

Among the matters of special interest to the Church at large are the arrangements for the publication of a *Liturgy* and *Hymnal* or *Tune Book*. Before another meeting of the General Synod, the Church may look for the appearance of a *Liturgy*, suitable to her wants as a guide in conducting the services of the Sanctuary and for special occasions, and the administration of the ordinances of God's house. This, if satisfactory, will meet a long felt want. The *Book of Worship* is also to be published with Tunes accompanying to aid in congregational singing. These publications, so important to the spiritual life and worship of our congregations, it is hoped will meet the long cherished desires and expectations of many, and add to the highest interests of genuine religion.

A pleasing, if not most important part of the proceedings of the General Synod, was the very cordial greetings of delegates from various corresponding bodies. For the first time, since the war, a delegate was greeted from the General Synod South, and the greeting was not only cordial, but most enthusiastic. The address by Rev. W. C. Schæffer, and the response by the venerable President, Dr. Strobel, will not soon be forgotten by those who heard them. Other addresses of delegates were in the very happiest style of Christian sentiment and expression, and produced a most delightful impression of Christian fellowship.

The report on *Literary and Theological Institutions* not only called attention to the importance of this part of our work, but emphasized the evils of individualism resulting in failures, discouragements and reproach to the cause. The General Synod was led to express its judgment very decidedly on this subject. It is believed that money and labor enough have been expended in the West, if well directed, to supply this

field with well endowed and efficient schools of a literary and theological character. The record of failures is sad and discouraging, and a weighty responsibility rests somewhere for the abuse of confidence reposed in the judgment of men. It is time that it should be understood that something more than good intentions are wanting to make an act right or to insure the divine favor which crowns with success. Men are responsible for the exercise of their reason and judgment, and nowhere is this truth more important than in matters of religion. Good men are liable to err, and there is constant need of charity, but when men go contrary to the judgment of the Church, and scorn all the lessons of experience and wisdom, they must expect to bear a full measure of responsibility for failures with all their consequences. Some individuals may have more wisdom than the combined Church, but the rule is the other way, and we have quite enough of individualism and its bitter fruits. The solemn advice of the Church is in harmony with divine revelation: "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety." The importance of German Theological Education was recognized and a committee appointed to consider the matter.

The Synod adjourned to meet in Altoona in 1881. We have not attempted a complete account of the doings of the General Synod, which may be learned from the very full reports contained in the daily and church papers. Nor have we intended to criticise the action of the General Synod in any of its proceedings. Our aim has been simply to give a very general idea of the spirit and leading topics of interest. So far as the former is concerned, we may freely say the spirit was one of harmony, forbearance, and kindness. There was an evident desire to keep the "unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." There were no angry discussions. On some points where difference of sentiment prevailed, there was the absence of harsh expressions, and a due regard for honest difference of opinion. No angry words were uttered or occasion given for hard feelings. That some were not wholly satisfied with what was done, was to be expected, but no one has any good reason for complaining of unbrotherly

treatment. The topics of interest were those which should claim the chief attention at every meeting of the General Synod. They are the subjects most immediately connected with the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom and the evangelization of the world. The General Synod may congratulate itself with having reached, for the time at least, such unanimity of views and sentiments as to call for little discussion on disputed points. The aim is not to lay again the foundations, but to build. The progress made is certainly not all that the friends of the Church could wish, but there is steady advance. Undoubtedly we should be doing much more than we are, but still our labor is not in vain. A more liberal spirit, and earnest yearning to accomplish more, a deeper consciousness of responsibility, are manifest, and they are the harbingers of good for the Church. We have abundant cause to thank God and take courage.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Conference Papers,* or Analyses of Discourses, doctrinal and practical, delivered on Sabbath afternoons to the Students of the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.; *Walks to Emmaus,* by Rev. Nehemiah Adams, edited by his son, Rev. H. Adams, a vol. of 20 Sermons; *Essays of To-Day, Religious and Theological,* by Rev. W. Wilberforce Newton; *From Egypt to Palestine through Sinai,* the Wilderness and the South Country, Observations of a Journey made with special reference to the history of the Israelites, with Maps and Illustrations, by S. C. Bartlett, D. D.; *Moses the Lawgiver,* a series of biographical discourses on the life of Moses, by Rev. W. M. Taylor, D. D.; *Faith and Rationalism,* with short Supplementary Essays on related topics, by G. P. Fisher, D. D.; *Palms of Elim,* or Rest and Refreshment in the Valleys, by J. R. Macduff, D. D.; *The Soul Here and Hereafter,* a Biblical Study, by C. M. Mead.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Etymological Dictionary of the English Language,* arranged on an historical basis, Part I.: A—Dor., by Rev. Walter W. Steat; *Science Lectures at South Kensington,* by W. Spottiswoode and others; *Problems of Life and Mind,* 3d Series, Prob-

lem first, Study of Psychology, its object, scope, and method, by G. H. Lewes; *Money in its Relations to Trade and Industry,* by Francis A. Walker; *Marriage,* with Preludes on Current Events, Boston Monday Lectures, by Jos. Cook; *The Evolution of Man,* a Popular Exposition of the Principal Points of Human Ontogeny and Phylogeny, from the German of Ernst Hæckel, Professor in the University of Jena, author of "The History of Creation," etc., forming No. 27 of "The International Series," with numerous illustrations in two vols.; *Modern Chromatics,* with applications to Art and Industry, with 130 original illustrations, by Ogden N. Rood, Prof. of Physics in Columbia College, No. 26 of "The International Series;" *The Relations of Mind and Brain,* by Henry Calderwood, LL. D., Prof. of Moral Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh—a defence of mental philosophy from the encroachments of materialistic science.

Historical and Biographical.—*The Life of J. M. W. Turner, R. A.,* with nine Illustrations etched by A. Brunet-Debaines; *Life and Adventures of Ernst Moritz Arndt,* the Singer of the German Fatherland, compiled from the German, with Preface, by Prof. J. Rob. Seeley; *History of Our Own Times,* from the Accession of Queen Victoria to Berlin Congress (Franklin Sq. Lib. No. 57); *Heroes of Bohemia,* Huss, Jerome, and Zisca, by Rev. J. W. Mears; *Cæsar,* a Sketch, by Jas. Antony Froude; *Life of Louis Adolphe Thiers,* by Francis Le Goff, translated from an unpublished manuscript, by Theodore Staunton. *History of the English People,* vol. III., Puritan England, 1603—1660, The Revolution 1660—1688, by J. R. Green.

Art.—*Renaissance in Italy*—the Fine Arts, by J. Addington Symonds.

Miscellaneous.—*Gleamings of Past Years,* 1843–1878—vol. 1, The Throne and the Prince Consort, the Cabinet and Constitution—vol. 2, Personal and Literary, Essays and Reviews of Gladstone from various prominent English Periodicals—vol. 3, Historical and Speculative—vol. 4, Foreign; *The Secret of Success,* or How to get on in the World, with remarks on true and false success, and art of making best use of life, by W. H. Davenport Adams; *Thoughts on the Religious Life,* with Introduction by W. C. Bryant, by Jos. Allen, D. D.; *The Story of Sigurd the Volsung,* and the Fall of the Niblungs, by W. Morris; *Manual of International Law,* by E. M. Gallaudet; *Sketches of Travel,* or Twelve Months in Europe, by Horatio King; *Communism in America,* Yale John A. Porter Prize Essay, for 1878, by H. Ammon James.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

HARPER & BROS., NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

From Egypt to Palestine through Sinai, the Wilderness and South Country. Observations of a Journey made with special reference to the History of the Israelites. By S. C. Bartlett, D. D., LL. D., President of Dartmouth College, and lately Professor in the Chicago Theological Seminary. With Maps and Illustrations. pp. 555. 1879.

It is only once in a while that we have occasion to notice a volume of so much interest and sterling value. Books on the East abound, and Egypt and the Holy Land have been written about until it might seem that nothing more was needed or possible. But many of these books are very hasty productions, furnishing what travelers have seen in a hasty journey or compiled from guide books, whilst on the other hand a few of them are so learned and costly as to place them beyond the reach of any but such as can afford time and money for the elaborate study of these topics. Dr. Bartlett has given us a volume combining the results of patient study and personal investigation, along with such descriptions and incidents as give a freshness and charm to the work. Along with several intelligent and observing companions, he undertook the journey through the countries described, for the purpose of studying on the ground and verifying the Bible accounts in the history of the children of Israel. He says: "It may explain the minuteness of statement on many points to say that the writer had specially in mind the difficulties which have been raised concerning the possibility of such a journey as that described in the Pentateuch—difficulties with which his studies had made him long familiar; and that his observations were somewhat steadily directed toward ascertaining the actual and possible condition of those regions, and the correspondence here between the land and the Book." It is impossible in a brief notice to give anything like a full view of the contents of this volume. The author beginning with a general view of Antiquity, as exhibited in the "Eternal City," carries us to Egypt, of which he gives a compendious view, touching especially on the points of most interest to Biblical scholars, and then following the Israelites on their journey through the wilderness, he brings us to the holy land. Here the places of deepest interest are described and many related facts discussed. It is a volume of sober, solid matter, and yet not at all heavy or dull. The learned and the unlearned reader may alike enjoy it. It is distinguished for intelligent observation, sobriety of

judgment, and candor in dealing with disputed points; and the information communicated makes a valuable addition to our knowledge of these countries and their connection with sacred history. The author occasionally gives utterance to sentiments that some will not relish. We notice that our Baptist friends are sorely exercised over some of his statements connected with the evidence afforded in regard to the mode of baptism. But no doubt had the statements been of an opposite character they would have been eagerly seized to support their view. The volume may be commended as one of substantial and permanent value, and which will be welcomed by all who are interested in such studies as it is designed to aid.

Moses the Law-Giver. By the Rev. William M. Taylor, D. D., Minister of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. pp. 482. 1879.

Dr. Taylor seems to understand the art of book-making. He utilizes his studies and preparation for the pulpit so as give them a wider if not more direct influence. This is, we believe, the fifth volume of a biographical character, which he has preached and published. Such a process doubtless tells upon his preparation in preaching, and serves at the same time to popularize the subjects of sacred story. In Moses he finds a fitting theme for serious study and moral reflection. By general consent Moses stands out as one of the most illustrious characters of all time. The leading incidents in his life are here brought to view, and the lessons for our own times sought out and applied. The volume bears evidence throughout of careful study. It is not a hasty production from a superficial reading of the Bible narrative, but the result of an examination of the best authorities, so as to gather the concentrated light of many sources. Of course it is popular in its style, and designed for the ordinary reader. The author has not been unmindful of the convenience and profit of his readers in supplying them with a suitable Index. It deserves and will take its place among the many volumes exhibiting to us the dealings of Divine Providence with His servants, and the lessons to be gathered from this rich field of study. Dr. Taylor does well in using the press to add to the power of the pulpit. It is a volume that may be read by ordinary Christians, and studied by those whose office it is to bring forth from the divine treasures things new and old. Preaching such as makes up this volume must be both interesting and instructive, and presents a striking contrast with some of the sensational utterances from the pulpit. It combines careful and varied study, happy selections of material, vigor of composition, fertility in illustration, pervaded by an earnest Christian spirit. "Dull as a sermon" has no application to this volume. Better to say, "interesting as romance" and sober as truth herself. It is hardly necessary to commend such a volume.

ENGLISH MEN OF LETTERS. Edited by John Morley.

Edmund Spenser. By R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's. pp. 180.

Robert Burns. By Principal Shairp. pp. 205. 1879.

Here two renowned poets—an earlier and later one—have found appreciative and sympathetic biographers. In accordance with the plan of this *Series,* these biographies are not designed to be exhaustive, but brief and popular. It is not easy to imagine anything more readable of their kind. The one carries the readers back three centuries, to the time when English literature was beginning to assume its modern cast and enshrine its most costly treasures. The other invites us to follow through his strange career the master of Scottish song. Perhaps no poet in our tongue, except Shakespeare, is so well known or so frequently quoted as Robert Burns. His biographer shows the pride and enthusiasm of a fellow countryman. In the *Dean of St. Paul's* and *Principal Shairp,* these two great poets have admiring, yet intelligent and discriminating, critics, and they have furnished their readers with volumes that will please and instruct. They will be admirable volumes for summer reading.

FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY. *A History of Our own Times* from the Accession of Queen Victoria to the Berlin Congress. By Justin McCarthy. Number 1, containing Vol. I and II. pp. 1112. *Eóthen:* or Traces of Israel brought home from the East. By Alexander William Kinglake, author of "The Invasion of the Crimea." pp. 41.

These, prices respectively 20 and 10 cents, are simply marvels of cheapness in printing. They equal in matter an ordinary volume of several hundred pages. The Messrs Harpers excel in publishing the cheapest as well as the most costly works. They furnish literature for the millions and for the selectest readers.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

The Grammar of Painting and Engraving. Translated from the French of Blanc's Grammaire des Arts du Dessin, by Kate Newell Doggett. With the Original Illustrations. Third Edition. pp. 330. 1879.

In this handsome octavo volume we have a work of unusual merit and value. As its name indicates, it is an exposition of the essential principles and established laws which are concerned in the expression of thought and sentiment through the fine arts. We believe it is the only work of its kind in the English language. It is meant for popular use, and begins with the elementary ideas of art, defining its ends and methods, and pointing out the primary conditions for the artist's successful work. It sets forth the laws of arrangement, composition, perspective, chiaro 'scuro, and color, the different kinds of painting,

fresco, wax, distemper, oil, pastel, enamel, miniature, and encaustic painting, and engraving in its chief forms. It, therefore, covers the whole subject, presenting a clear résumé of the accepted ideas underlying these arts and bringing into distinct view the abiding principles upon which all art criticism rests. The various points and rules presented are explained by over forty illustrations from various masters. The work is a very attractive one, and well suited to prepare the reader for intelligent appreciation, as well as higher enjoyment, of works of art.

It is unnecessary to point out a few things in the work from which we dissent. Coming from the French these things are expected. It is in place, however, to call attention to the inexcusably bad sentence with which the author begins. A sentence so involved and awkward is unworthy to open a discussion carried on afterward in a style so fitting and clear.

The Barque Future; or Life in the Far North. By Jonas Lie. Translated by Mrs. Ole Bull. pp. 253. 1879.

This is a very enjoyable story. It is specially interesting and valuable as a specimen and illustration of the Norwegian light literature. We are glad that the treasures of Norse thought, the unique creations of the northern imagination, are being opened up to us by the work of translators.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON.

Oh, Why Should the Spirit of Mortal be Proud? By William Knox. Designs by Miss L. B. Humphrey. Engraved by John Andrew and Son.

This handsomely illustrated volume is one—and if we are not mistaken the first—of a series which have been issued annually by Lee & Shepard. Some of the others have been noticed in former issues of this REVIEW, and strongly commended to those who desire a beautiful gift-book, or to have some of the sweetest gems of our poetry embellished by the exquisite skill and taste of the artist. We know of nothing, at so moderate a cost, that surpassses or equals these volumes. Along with "*Rock of Ages,*" and "*Abide With Me,*" this volume —"*Oh, Why should the Spirit of Mortal be Proud*"—is, and deserves to be, a favorite with the lovers of poetry and art.

Resurgit: A Collection of Hymns and Songs of the Resurrection. Edited, with Notes, by Frank Foxcroft. With an Introduction by Andrew Preston Peabody, D. D. pp. 352. 1879.

The idea of bringing together the resurrection-poetry of the Church is a happy one, and well carried out in this volume. Mr. Foxcroft has done his work with judgment and taste. He has drawn from all sources, and, in distinct group and chronological arrangement, has

presented hymns from the Greek, Latin, Russian, Danish, German, and Swedish, as well as English and American hymns. Without giving all the hymns on the subject, the collection is yet comprehensive, and fairly representative. It contains one hundred and seventy-seven pieces, extending over centuries of sacred song, and representing eight nationalities. Biographical notes of the writers and names of translators are prefixed to the hymns. It is a delightful and valuable volume, bringing together the best poetry that the heart of Christendom has gathered about the great fact of our Lord's resurrection. Of course the merit of the hymns gathered from such a wide field and out of different centuries, is unequal, but they becomes thereby more truly illustrative of the different countries and periods. The book is rich in gems of hymnal poetry, and shows how strongly the Redeemer's victory over death has inspired and the heart of the Church. —[For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.]

HOUGHTON, OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.

(For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.)

Marriage. With Preludes on Current Events. Boston Monday Lectures. By Joseph Cook. pp. 270. 1879.

This is the sixth volume of the "Boston Monday Lectures." Like those that have preceded it, it is full of vigorous and eloquent presentation of great truth. It contains ten Lectures: Infidel Attack on the Family, A Supreme Affection between Two, The Leper's Theory and Practice, Marriage without Love, Obstacles to Marriage, Love Without Marriage, Elective Affinities, or Who should Marry Whom? Gœthe and Shakspeare on Marriage, Inherited Educational Forces, Hereditary Taints in Blood. There is an equal number of Preludes, on topics of living and abiding interest.

These lectures are worthy of the widest circulation. Mr. Cook's dramatic method and scenic groupings of ancient and modern personages, objected to by some as out of place in printed discussions, are simply matters of taste. It should be born in mind that the lectures take their form from the freedom and demands of the platform, and are not to be judged by the standards of trimmed and chastened essay writing. But they discuss truths of vital importance to the physical and social welfare of mankind—truths that now need the vigorous and impressive vindication that the lecturer gives. They deal bravely with evils and dangers that need, in our time, to be looked fairly in the face; and wherever they are read they will help to promote sound thinking and to tone up the moral sense to a stern vindication of the principles of domestic and social purity.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

(For Sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.)

Conference Papers, or Analyses of Discourses, Doctrinal and Practical,

Delivered on Sabbath Afternoons to the Students of the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J., By Charles Hodge, D. D., pp. xv., 373. 1879.

This volume, in form and style, is a companion to the other posthumous volume, on Church Polity, by the distinguished Princeton divine. It embraces the discourses of Dr. Hodge delivered to the students at the Sunday Conference in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. The Preface informs us how carefully the author prepared for this exercise. "He prepared and wrote out a careful analysis or skeleton of every Conference discourse. Although designed to meet no eye but his own, these analyses are fully written out, and are verbally complete in all their articulations. And although his audience was completely changed every three years, it appears, that he never used the same preparation twice, but prepared even after he had passed his 80th year, a new paper for each Conference, often constructing analyses of the same theme several times." It is not improbable that what many mistook for free spontaneous utterance was the result of much study and careful elaboration—so little do we know of the processes by which most men attain to superior excellence. Dr. Hodge was a careful student and studied pen in hand. His eminence as a scholar and divine were not less due to close and continued study than to endowments of a high order. His example should be a lesson to others in this respect.

This volume is marked by the qnalities which distinguish all of Dr. Hodge's writings—robust good sense, clearness of perception, simplicity and vigor of style, reverence for God and divine things, and the entire absence of everything that would mar or destroy the good impressions made. As a homiletical study this volume will be valuable to theological students and ministers of the gospel. But highly as we estimate it, we do not consider it equal in interest or value to the one on Church Polity. This may be owing to the nature of the subjects treated. The subjects in this volume, from the nature of the case, are more practical and more familiar to the reader. There is little that is original or new, or that will be appealed to as authority. There is much that is spiritual and quickening. It addresses the heart more than the head, or the heart through the head. It treats chiefly of matters which are to be pondered and accepted "without controversy." It is very interesting and instructive to know how this prince among theologians acquitted himself in this very important part of theological training, and this volume not only furnishes the information, but at the same time the ripened fruit of profound spiritual meditation.

Faith and Rationalism with short supplementary Essays on Related

topics. By George P. Fisher, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. pp. 188. 1879.

This volume is the outgrowth of a lecture delivered before the Princeton Theological School. The author found his subject so attractive that he was led beyond the bounds of a lecture, and has produced this more extended discussion. It is not designed to be a full treatment of the subject named, yet it touches on most of the points involved in this now famous controversy. Dr. Fisher presents a a strong plea for the supernatural and our faith in the unseen and eternal. He charges Rationalism with arrogance and usurpation, and a disregard of claims that demand attention. He says: Rationalism denotes a certain usurpation of reason. The understanding steps out of its province, arrogates to itself more than belongs to it, refuses to hear other voices than its own, disregards the just claims of other departments of our being, or spurns the aid which they afford in the ascertaining of truths. The understanding exalts its own separate, insulated functions, pushes on without its natural auxiliaries—sensibility and conscience, the life and experience of the soul—and disdains feelings as an indirect source of light, and a legitimate warrant of conviction." Not the least interesting and important part of the volume is the Appendix of more than a hundred pages, in seven sections, embracing the following topics: "The teaching of Theology or the Moral Basis of Faith; The Doctrine of Nescience respecting God; The Doctrine of Evolution in its Relation to the Argument of Design; The Reasonableness of the Christian Doctrine of Prayer; Jesus was not a religious enthusiast; The Moral and Spiritual element in Atonement; The Unity of Belief among Christians." It is a very thoughtful and suggestive volume. Its calm and dignified tone contrasts most favorably with much that is written to discredit faith a nd religion among men.

Cæsar: A Sketch By James Anthony Froude, M. A. Formerly fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. pp. xviii., 550. 1879.

It may seem strange that we should lack even a tolerably satisfactory life of Julius Cæsar. Yet such was the case. Of a man whose name is on the lips of every one, this great Cæsar, we had no life that met the popular need, or that was really worthy of such a subject. The student still was sent to Plutarch to learn what he desired to learn. Merivale and Mommsen have done something in their histories to supply this need, but Froude has at last furnished a volume that will fill the vacant place, and be read by thousands with new interest. Cæsar is one of the names that will not soon die. The important part he played in the world's history, at a most eventful period, as well as his own eminent qualities, will secure for him lasting atten-

tion. Our author has made use of the original authorities, and with that power of delineation for which he is distinguished, has produced a volume of rare interest and power. It furnishes sketches of other leading actors only second in interest to that of Cæsar himself. The story of that period is told with dramatic effect. We cannot follow it through the life like pictures, from the opening scene until the curtain falls. Mr. Froude is evidently an ardent admirer of Cæsar, and may have painted a fairer picture than truth will warrant, yet it is well to have the best said that can be said. We doubt the taste of the comparison with which the volume closes "between the fate of the founder of the kingdom of this world and the Founder of the kingdom not of this world." The capital letter with which the one is honored will hardly satisfy the supreme reverence in which the one is held above all mere earthly dignitaries.

PHILLIPS AND HUNT, NEW YORK.

Studies in Theism. By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University, and author of "The Philosophy of Herbert Spencer." pp. vi., 444. 1879.

Professor Bowne was already well and favorably known to scholars by his able review of Herbert Spencer's Philosophy. It is doubtful if any thing at all equal to it in acuteness and comprehensiveness has appeared in our language on the subject of this great writer's system. The weak points were thoroughly exposed, and its pretentiousness made to appear as little better than shallow superficiality under the guise of sounding terms. He has ventured on another volume treating of high themes. The present volume is modest in its title. It does not pretend to be a complete treatise, but only "*Studies in Theism.*" The author says of the papers which make up the volume, that they have been written long enough to make him somewhat dissatisfied with them. Still for lack of time to re-write, he gives them to the public. We are not sure that this is a good reason for publishing a volume on so momentous a subject, and which now demands the utmost care in thought and composition. No one should venture on this field, after it has been beaten over by so many great writers, unless he is quite sure that he has something to offer that will repay for the attention and study demanded. Still we are not disposed to find fault with Prof. Bowne for this publication. It will help to settle the controversy which is still going on, and likely to continue, between believers and unbelievers, in the existence of a Divine Being. Much has been written, and much more doubtless will be written, on this subject of subjects, and no one or a few productions will make an end of the controversy. Each successive age will renew and carry on the dispute, until all objections shall be silenced, by the stopping of every mouth by God himself. This volume is in a philosophical vein,

although the author says he has "not written for a philosophical audience." It touches on a number of the subjects which are fundamental to philosophy and theology, and it touches on them with a firm and vigorous hand. It is not the style of our author to beg pardon of the opponents of *Theism* for having a word to say. He claims a right to a hearing in behalf of reason and common sense. He shows that those who speak so boldly on the other side have no occasion to be so very confident. Professor Bowne is perhaps better at spying out the weak points of his adversaries and their positions than in positive support of the truth. A good deal in this volume is aimed to show the unsatisfactory character of the systems that are opposing themselves to a sound Theism. Starting with "Knowledge and Skepticism," and concluding with "The Soul : Spiritualism or Materialism, and the "Postulates of Ethics," he does fully show how utterly untenable and unsatisfactory must be all philosophy that ignores God, the human soul, and immortality. The style of the volume is very simple and clear. The writer aims to say what he wishes in the most direct and matter of fact manner. Yet the style is vigorous, and not a dull sentence appears. Language is used for its legitimate purpose, and our author knows how to wield it with power. We might very easily present passages which would illustrate the vigor of thought and power of expression contained in this volume, but we must content ourselves with pointing our readers to the concluding chapters, where the author brings us more directly face to face with the outcome or logical conclusions of skepticisms. Here he is earnest, as in a hand to hand fight. He says : "Let then the question be dragged into light, and let it be kept there until loose-jointed skepticism shall learn what it is doing, and until speculative trickery shall be forced to be consistent, and to accept the logical outcome of its opinions." This is just what this volume helps to do, and we commend it to all interested in the settlement of what must always be the main question.

J. M. STODDARDT & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

The Encyclopædia Britannica. A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences and General Literature. Ninth Edition. (American Reprint). Vol. IX. pp. 752. 1879.

The ninth volume of this great work is in hand. It extends only to the end of the letter F. At this rate it is not likely to be completed in sixteen volumes. We should think it will take nearer twice that number. The work, however, is progressing regularly, and must be of immense value—a library in itself. Little more is necessary than to announce the appearance of another volume, as the character of the work is understood by all likely to be interested in it. It may be observed, however, that the volume presents the usual variety of con-

tents, including something in nearly every department of knowledge. In biography we have such names as Faraday, Farragut, Faustus, Fenelon, Fichte, Foster, Fox, Franklin, (Benjamin and Sir John), Frederick the Great, Fuller (Thomas), etc. In geography and history, Falkland Islands, Fiji Islands, Finland, France, etc. France receives the fullest treatment, but such subjects as finance, fine arts, fisheries, forests, fortification, free trade, etc., receive a fair degree of attention. The amount of valuable information condensed into a work such as this, is truly wonderful; and although some errors may and will creep in, the general accuracy makes it invaluable for reference. It indicates, too, the progress making in this age. Scarcely any discussion of any topic even twenty or thirty years ago, will suffice for the present day. In every department the knowledge is so much fuller and more trustworthy, that former statements require to be modified or corrected, or extended. Scarcely any thing marks more clearly the progress of the age than new editions of such a work as this Encyclopædia. The next generation will doubtless be still further in advance of the present. But for the present in which we live, this work is of surpassing interest and value. Every new volume only serves to enhance our estimate of its worth to all who need a work of the kind.

J. FRED'K SMITH, PHILADELPHIA.

Life Pictures of Spener and His Times. Philipp Jacob Spener. A Historical Life Picture. Translated from the German of Dr. A. Wildenhahn. By Rev. G. A. Wenzel, A. M. Edited by J. K. Shryock, A. M., Editor of the "Fatherland Series." pp. 468. 1879.

This volume aims to combine the charm of romance with the truth of history. It is a story, but a story based on truth. Dr. Wildenhahn has a distinguished reputation in this line of historical painting. Some of the productions of his pen have already been given to the public in an English dress, and this is another venture in the same direction. The story has much to commend it. The subject is one that, although somewhat familiar, has an abiding interest. Few men in the religious world have occupied a more conspicuous position, or left a deeper impression on the piety of the Church, than Philipp Jacob Spener. His name and his school of religion are historic; and whatever difference of opinion may exist in regard to some features of Pietism, which owes its name to Spener, there can be no difference in regard to the exalted Christian character of the man.

In this volume the story of that great religious movement is told, and no one can read it without becoming deeply interested. Although a translation, the style is easy and flowing. It is the language of heart and life. The translation, we believe, appeared some years ago in numbers in the *Lutheran,* and was read with interest. It is now presented in a more permanent form, and where it can be read with-

out the awkward interruptions of a serial story. The Introduction by Dr. Krauth was originally prepared and published with another volume of Dr. Wildenhahn—"The Blind Girl of Wittenberg," translated by Dr. J. G. Morris. It serves equally well for both. The material of this volume, in this new dress, must prove attractive reading. Many, who would not read a sober history of Pietism, will be induced to read these "life pictures," and will find pleasure and profit. It is well adapted to family reading and the Sunday School. We bespeak for it a wide circulation, assured that its influence will be good.

D. LOTHROP & CO., BOSTON.

Walks to Emmaus. By the late Rev. Nehemiah Adams, D. D. Edited by his son, Rev. William H. Adams. pp. 360. 1879.

Dr. Adams was known as one of the ornaments of the American pulpit. Few men combined so many qualities of substantial popularity. For forty years he kept his hold on his hearers. Possessed of a style of singular transparency and freshness, he presented the great truths of the Gospel in the most attractive light. He has left behind him a valuable legacy in his numerous volumes. D. Lothrop & Co., Boston, are issuing new and uniform editions of most or all of his works. This volume, "*Walks to Emmaus,*" is the first of a series for Sunday reading. Other volumes will follow, so as to furnish sermons for every Sabbath in the year. For family reading they will be found very suitable. For ministers of the Gospel they will furnish a good homiletical study. They can hardly be called great sermons, in the sense that Massilon, or Jeremy Taylor, or Barrow, or Chalmers, or Hall are great. But they are great in other respects, and will repay a careful study. They reveal the secret of his power in the pulpit, and show how the truth, when presented in genuine simplicity and tenderness, will triumph. These volumes cannot have too wide a circulation.

Entertainments. Comprising Directions for holding Merry-Makings, New Programmes for Amateur Performances, and Many Novel Sunday-School Exercises. Collected and edited by Lizzie W. Champney.

We confess to no very great taste for *entertainments* of this character, and hence are not very good critics of works designed for such a purpose. It may be a want of appreciation, and we would not decry the taste of others. Our author truly says: "Entertainments the multitude will have," and it is a question how far Christians shall use this power to mould the popular mind and heart. Certainly religion is no enemy to the genuine pleasures of life, and it is lawful for Christians to make life cheerful and bright. The pieces in this volume have been prepared by well-know authors, and are endorsed by those whose names should carry weight. So far as we are competent to

judge—and we repeat our confession of lack of competency—the volume is well calculated to aid in providing entertainments of an unexceptionable character. Those who are interested in providing such entertainments for the young, will find here the aid they may need. We are informed that "Most of the matter is new, and is contributed by persons of experience in amateur theatricals, musical matters and entertainments of all kinds, and who represent, in their respective beliefs, the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Unitarian and Congregational Churches."

Yensie Walton. By Mrs. S. R. Graham Clark. pp. 391. 1879.

This book is much superior to many of its class. Indeed it may be safely commended as unexceptionable in sentiment, and stimulating in the best sense of the word. Regarded as a story, graphically told, it might deserve commendation, but the moral and religious lessons inculcated entitle it to more than ordinary favor. The development of character under peculiar trials and severe discipline is well presented; and the true foundation of all genuine Christian character is not lost sight of. It is not a book for young children, but for those who can appreciate the design and lessons to be learned. Yensie Walton awakens our sympathy, and in the end our love and gratitude are called forth for the grace that does so much for such frail creatures as we. It is intimated that there will be a sequel to this interesting and instructive story.

Six Month's at Mr. Prior's. By Emily Adams. pp. 250. 1879.

Another story, differing widely from the one just noticed. Mrs. Prior is the widow of a clergyman, in limited circumstances, and the story tells how she managed to adjust herself to her condition, and to teach the same lesson to her children. It is a very good story for girls, many of whom need the very lessons here inculcated. The sober realities of life are presented under the coloring of imaginary scenes, and the impressions made must be salutary.

Poor Papa. By Mary W. Porter. pp. 218. 1879.

This is one of the "*Idle Hour Series,*" and is sufficiently romantic to be popular. The perplexed and tried "poor papa" finds the happy remedy for his trials in one who is glad to take much of his burden. There is no cure for such troubles equal to a good wife, and the author of this volume has safely hit the remedy.

J. K. SHRYOCK, PHILADELPHIA.

The Pastor's Confirmation Gift. From the German. By Rev. Wm. H. Gotwald, A. M. pp. 93. 1879.

This little volume is very well adapted to the object in view. It will be a very fitting present from a pastor to those confirmed, and its counsels followed will guide in the way of life.

LUTHERAN CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Joh. Guilielmi Baieri Compendium Theologiæ Positivæ, etc. Tom. 4, pp. 81–176; Tom. 5, pp. 177–272. 1879.

This is parts 4th and 5th of Baier's Compend, appearing in numbers, from the Lutheran Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis Mo. The work was noticed in the last number of the REVIEW. We are glad to announce the continued arrival of the parts as they appear.

Ninth Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of Public Charities of the State of Pennsylvania for 1878. pp. 323.

We are indebted to our esteemed friend, Diller Luther, M. D., General Agent and Secretary, for a copy of this interesting and satisfactory report. It embodies a large amount of valuable information relating to the general objects embraced in the volume. The matter is systematically arranged, and the volume supplied with an Index to facilitate consultation or reference. It is one of the many evidences of the progress of Christian philanthropy and beneficence that so much is undertaken and accomplished in behalf of the afflicted and suffering. The "Board of Public Charities" has been directly and indirectly accomplishing great good. It is not always easy to trace the varied influences which a great benevolent agency may exercise. Some of them are easily noticeable, others are more hidden and remote. But there can be no doubt that thousands have their condition greatly ameliorated by the agency of this charity, and that in years to come the influence will widen and extend itself more and more. Such a work is eminently worthy of this great Commonwealth, and deserves our warmest sympathies.

Ministers' Hand-Book to Lutheran Hymns in the "Book of Worship." By Rev. Sylvanus Stall, A. M., author of the "Pastor's Pocket Manual, or Perpetual Pocket Record." Printed by Skinner & Finch, Easton, Pa. For sale by Lutheran Board of Publication, 42 North 9th St., Philadelphia, Pa., and Severinghaus & Co., 447 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Ill. pp. 122. 1879.

This is a very complete and useful guide for ministers in the selection of suitable hymns. The author has bestowed much labor and care in its preparation, and deserves well of his brethren and the Church.

CONTENTS OF NO. III.

—o—

Article. Page.

I. Relation of Children to the Church,..... 325
By M. Valentine, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

II. The Messianic Idea in Pre-Christian Apocalyptic Literature,..... 346
By Rev. George H. Schodde, A. M., Ph. D., Martin's Ferry, Ohio.

III. The Chinese Problem, or Agnosticism Worked Out, 371
By C. A. Stork, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

IV. Regeneration by Baptism,..... 390
By Rev. Prof. E. F. Giese, Carthage College, Ill.

V. The Ritual of the Lord's Supper, ... 421
*Translated from the German of the Rev. Dr. E. Stæhelin, of Basel, by Rev. G. F. Behringer, Mendon, Ill.

VI. Sketch of Muhlenberg Mission, Africa,..... 449
By Rev. J. A. Clutz, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

VII. General Synod,..... 464

VIII. Literary Intelligence,..... 469
Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—Art—Miscellaneous.

IX. Notices of New Publications,..... 471
From Egypt to Palestine through Sinai, the Wilderness and South Country—Moses the Law-Giver—Edmund Spenser—Robert Burns—A History of Our Own Times—Eothen—The Grammar of Painting and Engraving—The Barque Future—Oh, Why Should the Spirit of Mortal be Proud?—Resurgit—Marriage—Conference Papers—Faith and Rationalism—Cæsar—Studies in Theism—The Encyclopædia Britannica—Life Pictures of Spener and His Times—Walks to Emmaus—Entertainments—Yensie Walton—Six Months at Mrs. Prior's—Poor Papa—Ministers' Hand-Book—The Pastor's Confirmation Gift—Joh. Guilielmi Baieri Compendium Theologiæ Positivæ.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

OCTOBER, 1879.

ARTICLE I.

CHURCH ORDERS: OR THE NECESSITY OF A RIGHT CALL TO THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTRY.*

By L. A. GOTWALD, D. D., York, Pa.

In looking at the catalogue of distinguished persons who, in this course of Lectures, have addressed you upon the successive Articles of our precious *Confessio Augustana*, I feel an unaffected diffidence in now appearing before you. The importance also of the subject, and the limited time for its consideration which, amid the unceasing duties of a large pastoral work, I have been able to command, intensify that diffidence.

Through the partiality, however, of my brethren who constitute the Board of Directors of this Seminary, I have been chosen to discharge this duty, and hence, bowing to their judgment in the matter, and waiving my own, I assume the labor and proceed to address you upon *The Fourteenth Article of The Augsburg Confession.*

THE TEXT OF THE ARTICLE.

Article XIV. of the Augsburg Confession reads as follows:

"De ordine ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in ecclesia publice docere aut sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus."—*Müller, Symbolischen Bücher*, p. 42.

"Vom Kirchen Regiment wird gelehrt, das niemand in der

* Fourteenth Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, on the Holman Foundation, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., by L. A. Gotwald, D. D., May 19th and 20th, 1879.

Kirchen öffentlich lehren oder predigen, oder Sacrament reichen soll ohne ordentlichen Beruf."—*Müller*, p. 42.

"Concerning Ecclesiastical Orders [Church Government], they teach that no man should publicly in the Church teach, or administer the Sacraments, except he be rightly called [without a regular call]."—*Schaff's Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 3, p. 15.

Both the Latin and the German texts of the "*editio princeps*," 1531, underwent subsequently, by different hands, certain slight changes and emendations. The Codex Nuremburgensis, *e. g.*, has "*vocatis*" for "*vocatus.*" The "*editio Variata*" (1540 et 42) adds also the words: "Sicut et Paulus præcipit Tito, ut in civitatibus Presbyteros constituat," (Tit. 1: 5 sq.); an addition which was not, it is true, absolutely necessary, but which still, as an exposition of the final clause of the Article, serves a most useful purpose. For, as Bilmar (*Die Augsburgische Confession Erklärt von* A. F. C. Bilmar, *weiland Professor der Theologie zu Marburg*, p. 129) properly remarks concerning it: "Ein Satz, der zwar an sich nicht nötig, aber zur erläutering des *rite vocatus* doch sehr dienlich ist."

In the German text Spalatin inserts, after the word "*gelehrt*," the additional words "*und gepredigt*," making the first clause read: "Vom Kirchen-regiment wird gelehrt und gepredigt." In the Anspacher deutsche Handschriften, No. 2, the final phrase "*ohne ordentlichen Beruf*," is transposed and inserted already after the word "*niemand*," so as to read "Vom Kirchen-regiment wird gelehrt das niemand ohne ordentlichen Beruf in der Kirchen öffentlich lehren oder predigen, oder Sacrament reichen soll." Spalatin also substitutes the words "*oder auch die*" for the single word "*oder*" just before "*predigen.*" And he also substitutes the words "*er sey denn zufor dartzu ordentlich beruffen*," for the words "*ohne ordentlichen Beruf.*"—*Vide Zöckler über Die Augsburgische Confession*, pp. 244, 245.

These changes are all merely verbal, and do not, even in the slightest degree, affect the doctrinal sense of the Article.

THE HISTORICAL OCCASION OF THE ARTICLE.

This Article of the Confession occupies upon the subject

of the ministry, concerning which it treats, a middle or conservative position. It stands midway between two extreme and equally false positions. Like a sharp double-eged sword, it cuts relentlessly into the errors of both.

The one extreme against which it thus stands opposed, and which it designedly and clearly condemns, is the Anabaptist or fanatical extreme, so prevalent in the days of the Reformation, which denied the very existence of the ministerial office, and which taught that all whom impulse might at any time, or in any way or place, move to it, were equally entitled to speak and be heard in the Church as religious teachers. Believing in what they called "the inward word or light," or "an immediate revelation," they held that the objective or written word was insufficient and ineffectual to enlighten, convert and sanctify man, (*Schott on Augs. Con.*, p. 87); proceeding even so far as to maintain that the Spirit of God *could not* work by means of any thing outer or external, and did not, in the least, bind Himself thus to work through the objective or external, (*Vide Plitt's Einleitung in die Augustana*, vol. 2, p. 172). Thus denying the necessity of the written *word*, as a means of grace, they logically, of course, also denied the necessity of a special *ministry* to preach that word. And hence, as we find, they loudly disowned the existence of such a thing as the ministerial office. They assailed the education of men for the ministry, holding that such education was unnecessary, since every true Christian was urged on by the Spirit of God, and was possessed of a superior inner wisdom. All Christians they asserted, were, by the direct revelation of God's will within them, brought into possession of the truth, and were both competent and authorized, at will, to proclaim that truth to others.

Against this fanatical spirit, thus ignoring both the written word and the ministry, as a special office to preach that word, Luther, from the beginning, set himself with unflinching and desperate earnestness, both by voice and pen assailing and denouncing it. In the year 1525, he issued his famous tract, entitled "*Die Himmlischen Propheten*," in which he utters against it his fiercest invectives. Nor did

he rest until, at last, it was suppressed and its power for evil broken. Speaking of the Scriptures as the divinely ordained instrumentality by which man is brought to a knowledge of sin, and afterward also of the saving grace of God through Christ, he says: "Im selben Wort kompt der Geist und giebt den Glauben, wo und welchem er will. Wer dir eine andre Ordnung furschlagt, da zweifel nicht es sei der Teufel," (*De Wette*, 2, 579).

And against this same extreme and fanatical spirit, is this Fourteenth Article of the *Confession* directed. Instead of ignoring the word and sacraments, it recognizes them as the sole and only channels or means of grace to man; and instead of denying the ministerial office, it boldly asserts and assumes it, and teaches who, and who only, shall fill it.

The Article, it may be noted, is negative in its statement. It says who shall *not* perform ministerial acts, *i. e.* who shall *not* preach the word, and who shall *not* administer the sacraments. But this statement of the doctrine negatively is really the expression of it in the strongest possible positive form. It is the emphatic declaration of the fact that there is an "*Ordo*," a special and sacred ministerial *office*, and that into this office no one shall dare to enter unless he be "rightly called" into it. The functions of the office, it declares, shall be discharged by those only who are in the office.

But this Article of the Confession is directed also, on the other hand, against another and opposite extreme concerning the ministry. Whilst so earnestly maintaining that there *is* an office of the ministry, it yet also, at the same time and with equal firmness, maintains that it is *only* an office. This Article, therefore, stands in open array against the teachings concerning the ministry of the Church of Rome, as well as against the fanatical Anabaptist spirit prevalent in the days of the Reformers. For Rome, as is well known, makes the ministry a priesthood, and the ministerial office she arrogantly exalts into a separate and superior ministerial order. (Vide "*Symbolism*," by J. A. Mœhler, D. D., pp. 311–316. Also "*Canones et Decreta Dogmatica Concilii Tridentini, De Sacramento Ordinis.*") Most inconsistently she makes little or

nothing of the written *word*, as a means of grace, but, at the same time, makes much, and almost every thing, indeed, of the visible or objective *sacraments*, which, rightly understood, are the visible and objective word. (Vide *Book of Concord*, *Apology*, p. 265.) She teaches (*Plitt's Einleitung in die Augustana*, vol. 2, p. 366, 367,) that justifying grace is imparted to man through the channel or medium of the sacraments. The primal source of this grace, she acknowledges, is Jesus Christ, who, seated at the right hand of the Father, is essentially the only Mediator. But this grace He does not impart directly and without means. On the contrary He has ordained an "*Order*" to whom He has granted authority in His stead, to administer the sacraments, and who serve as mediators between Him, the Head of the Church, and Christians, as members of the same. The bestowal of this authority thus to mediate grace from Christ to His people, in and through the sacraments, occurs only in what is itself a sacrament, viz. the sacrament of holy orders, or consecration to the priesthood, which can only be administered by a bishop. In or through this sacrament of consecration or priestly ordination, the person ordained receives, once for all, divine commission and authority to administer the sacraments, and through them to impart saving grace to those receiving them. And in order that they may always and rightly administer the sacraments, there is further in ordination imparted to them an indestructible priestly character, (*character indelibilis*) and there is then impressed upon them a distinctive and indelible official token or relation. Just as baptism distinguishes the baptized from those who are not baptized, so this character, imparted in ordination, divides the priesthood from the laity permanently and forever. The priesthood, by ordination, become a "*class*" or separate "*order.*" They are lifted up by it above the great mass of other Christians, and placed in a range, not of official power merely, but of personal sanctity and superiority, far above them. To them only, as a special and distinct order, Christ gives the dispensing of sacramental grace, so that upon their mediating priestly services all Christians, if they wish to be saved, are entirely dependent,

and to their authority they must be implicitly subject. Especially is all this the case in view of the fact that the priest in ordination, as the highest and most sacred prerogative conferred by that sacrament, receives divine power, in the sacrifice of the Mass, to change the bread and the wine into the literal or real body and blood of Christ, and then to present them to God, as an acceptable offering for Christians, and as the highest possible act of worship. This power thus to offer the sacrifice of the Mass, the priest could not possess nor execute, had he not in ordination received also an especial call (*vocatio*) to execute it.

The Council of Trent distinctly declares: "If any one saith that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood; or that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of Christ, and of forgiving and retaining sins; but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all: let him be anathema." And again: "If any one saith that order or sacred ordination is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord; or that it is a kind of human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters; or that it is only a kind of rite for choosing ministers of the word of God and of the sacraments: let him be anathema." (*Schaff's Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 2, p. 191. See, also, "*History of the Council of Trent, from the French of L. F. Bungener*," pp. 369–372.)

Such is the theory of the Church of Rome, both concerning the ministry itself and the call to it. The ministry is an order, and he only is in this order who has, by episcopal ordination, been placed in it.

Of this theory our Article XIV. of the Augsburg Confession is an emphatic refutation. It gives, upon its very face, a marked prominence to the public preaching or teaching of God's word, as the first and principal part of ministerial work, and it thus strikes a direct blow at the conception of the ministry as a priesthood, called or ordained simply or chiefly to offer sacrifices and to mediate between God and man. And whilst agreeing with the Church of Rome that

no one should publicly in the church preach the word or administer the sacraments unless he be rightly called, there is yet here, by no means, an admission, as claimed by the Romish Church, that those only *are* thus rightly called whom a Romish Bishop, as one of the successors of the Apostles, and *jure divino*, has ordained. On the contrary, the Article, with noble silence, assumes the negative of all such arrogant claims, and does not stoop even to enter a formal denial. Articles V. and XXVIII., however, in spirit at least if not in words, do deny it. The spirit also of the entire Confession, as also of the whole work of the Reformation, refutes it. For the Reformation, in its last analysis, was simply a sublime protest against this false and crushing sacerdotalism of Rome. The writings of the Reformers, also, and the Confessions throughout (*Apology*, VII. Eng. tr., p. 265) abound in refutations of this theory that ordination by the hands of a Romish Bishop, or by any episcopal hands, as an exclusive, divinely-conferred prerogative, alone constitutes a valid and true introduction of a man to the office and work of the ministry. Luther says: "Sacerdos in novo testamento non fit, sed nascitur, non ordinatur, sed creatur." (*Opp. Jena*, 2, p. 580). And Melanchthon in the Apology (Art. XIV. *De Ordine Ecclesiastico*) expressly declares, in his exposition of this Article, that the Reformers, for the sake of peace, were most willing to assist in maintaining the old ecclesiastical regulations and episcopal government, that is, were willing to concede to receive ordination from the hands of Romish Bishops, provided they were to be recognized as bishops only in the New Testament sense of *pastor*, in which every minister of the gospel is a bishop, and provided it was mutually understood that their exercise of such episcopal functions in ordination was not *de jure divino*, but only *de jure humano*. The Apology reads as follows: "The Fourteenth Article in which we say that no one should be permitted to preach, or to administer the sacraments in the Church, except those only who are duly called, they accept, provided that we mean by this the call of priests, who are ordained or consecrated according

to the canons. On this subject we have several times declared in this convention, that we are most willing to assist in maintaining the old ecclesiastical regulations and episcopal government, which is called *canonica politia*, provided the bishops would tolerate our doctrine, and receive our priests. But the bishops have hitherto persecuted and murdered our ministers contrary to their own laws. Nor have we as yet been able to induce them to desist from this tyranny. Our opponents are, therefore, to blame that the bishops are not obeyed, and we are excused before God and all pious men. For since the bishops will not tolerate our divines, unless they reject the doctrine which we profess, and which we are bound before God to confess and maintain, we cannot recognize the bishops, and prefer to obey God, knowing that the Christian Church is wherever the word of God is correctly taught. Let the bishops see to it how they can answer for the distraction and devastation of the churches by such tyranny." (*Book of Concord*, Eng. trans., p. 267). The language, also, of the Smalcald Articles is very clear upon this point. Article X. (*De Initiatione, Ordine et Vocatione*) says: "If the bishops would discharge their office faithfully, and take due care of the Church and the Gospel, they might, for the sake of charity and tranquility, not however from necessity, be allowed the privilege of ordaining and confirming us and our preachers; yet with this condition, that all unchristian masking, mummery and jugglery should be removed. But since they neither are, nor wish to be, true bishops, but political lords and princes, who will neither preach nor teach, nor baptize, nor administer the sacrament, nor transact any work or office in the Church, but force, persecute and condemn those who are called to this office, the Church must not, on their account, remain destitute of ministers."

This Article of our Confession, therefore, is, as we before remarked, in its very essence, a firm protest not only against the unchurchly and destructive extreme which entirely ignores and disowns the ministerial office, but also against the opposite extreme of the Church of Rome which elevates the

office into a holy order or sacrament. The Article owes its very existence, indeed, in the Confession, to these two equally wrong and ruinous conceptions of the ministry which then prevailed and which still prevail. Mœhler ("*Symbolism*," p. 315) speaking of this Fourteenth Article, says it is "an Article which in the Lutheran system is utterly unintelligible, and to which, therefore, we can assign no place therein." "It is too," he adds, "a consequence of the accidental character of this Article that it merely asserts that every teacher is to be called in a lawful manner, without at all determining in what this lawfulness consists." But the Article is not unintelligible. It is not accidental. It had, in the minds of the framers of the Confession, a specific and clearly defined purpose; and it occupies, in the Confession itself, a designed and important place. It was seen to be needed, and hence also was inserted. Article V. speaks of the office itself; and this Article teaches by whom, and by whom only, the functions of the office are to be exercised. *That* has reference to the object and nature of the ministry; *this* to the call to the ministry. *That* to the work; *this* to the workmen. And hence, also, the Article properly stands *in* the Confession just *where* it stands. For, the logical order of thought demands, not that it should come, as some might have supposed, immediately following Article V., but exactly where it does come—viz. after Article XIII., on "*The Use of the Sacraments*," and just before Article XV., "*Of Church Rites and Ordinances.*"

THE SUBSTANTIAL HARMONY OF THIS ARTICLE WITH THE TEACHINGS OF OTHER PROTESTANT CONFESSIONS UPON THE SUBJECT OF THE MINISTRY.

But, whilst this Article of our Confession is thus utterly, in its spirit and scope, opposed to the Romish conception of the ministry, as also to the directly opposite or Anabaptist conception of it, it is yet pleasant to note that it is, upon this whole subject, in entire harmony with all the great historic Protestant Confessions which, since the days of the Reformation, have moulded the thought and the faith of

Protestant Christendom. All Protestant Creeds recognize the ministry as an office, and either assert or imply that no one should discharge the special and sacred functions of the office unless he be first rightly inducted into the office. Or, as Dr. Hodge, ("*Systematic Theology*," vol. III., p. 514,) speaking upon the question of who should administer the sacraments, says: "Lutherans and Reformed agree in teaching, first, that the efficacy of the sacraments does not depend on anything in him who administers them; and, secondly, that as the ministry of the word and sacraments are united in the Scriptures, it is a matter of order and propriety that the sacraments should be administered by those only who have been duly called and appointed to that service."

In entire accord, therefore, with the teachings of this Fourteenth Article of our Confession, which we are now considering, the language of the Westminster Confession (*Confession of Faith*, chap. xxvii., 4) is:

"There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ, our Lord, in the Gospel. That is to say, baptism and the Lord's Supper; neither of which may be dispensed by any but by a minister of the word, lawfully ordained."

The Thirty-Nine Articles, also, of the Church of England, upon this matter of the necessity of a call to the ministry, as, indeed, upon almost every other point, simply echo the teachings of our Augsburg Confession. Article XXII. declares:

"It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

The First Helvetic Confession, also, composed by a number of Swiss divines, delegated and assembled for the purpose in the city of Basle, in the year 1536, and which was the first Confession which represented the faith of all the Reformed cantons of Switzerland, says:

"This office and this service of the ministry shall be entrusted to no one unless he has been first well instructed concerning the knowledge and will of God, blameless in piety and uprightness of life, and been found and recognized by the ministers and proper authorities of the Church to be earnest and zealous to advance the glory of the name of Christ."—*Creeds of Christendom*, vol. III., p. 221.

The language also of the *Second* Helvetic Confession, drawn up by Henry Bullinger of Zürich, Zwingle's successor, first published in Latin in 1566, and which Hagenbach calls "*ein wahres dogmatisches Meisterstück*," is equally emphatic upon this point of the necessity of a call to the ministry. It says, (chapter xviii., sec. 8, *De Ministris Ecclesiæ*):

"No one ought to assume to himself the honor of the gospel ministry, *i. e.* no one should receive it for himself as a mere gift of patronage, or by any trick or art, or by his own mere will. Ministers of the Church may be called and chosen in a lawful ecclesiastical election; *i. e.* they may be solemnly elected by the Church, or by those deputed by the Church for this purpose, in a proper and regular manner, without disorder, discord or contention. And those who are elected shall be ordained by the presbyters (*senioribus*), with a public charge or address, and with the laying on of hands. Hence we here condemn all those who run of their own accord, when they have neither been elected, sent, nor ordained. (Jer. 23 : 32). We condemn a ministry which is unqualified, and not instructed nor possessed of the gifts necessary for the pastoral office."—*Creed's of Christendom*, vol. III., p. 280).

In the French Confession of Faith, also, prepared principally by Calvin, revised and approved by a Synod of Paris, in 1559, and adopted by the Synod of La Rochelle in 1517, there is this language upon the point before us:

"We believe that no person should undertake to govern the Church upon his own authority, but that this should be derived from elections, as far as it is possible, and as God will permit. And we make this exception especially because sometimes, and even in our own days, when the state of the

Church has been interrupted, it has been necessary for God to raise men in an extraordinary manner to restore the Church which was in ruin and desolation. But, notwithstanding, we believe that this rule must always be binding: that all pastors, overseers and deacons should have evidence of being called to their office."—*Schaff's Creeds of Christendom*, vol. III., p. 377.

And the same is taught, also, in all the other principal Confessions dating back to the Reformation period; *e. g.* in the First Scotch Confession (1560), in the Belgic Confession (1561), in the Irish Articles of Religion (1615), and in the Savoy Declaration (1658), as also in other Confessions of minor historical importance.

Hence, no matter how widely our different Protestant Confessions differ upon *other* points, and no matter how much each one of our various Protestant branches may in this day of laxity, both in doctrine and practice, disregard and violate its own Confession, it nevertheless is a fact that in this one point of the necessity of a regular call before assuming to exercise the office of the gospel ministry, they do all theoretically and with hearty unanimity agree, and do all with one accord hold and teach, in the words of this Fourteenth Article of our own Confession: "De ordine Ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in Ecclesia publice docere aut Sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus."

THE HARMONY OF THIS ARTICLE WITH THE TEACHINGS OF GOD'S WORD.

But a question of greater importance concerning this Article of our Confession is, not whether it accords with the teachings of other Confessions, for they and it may possibly both, as uninspired and merely human productions, be wrong, but whether it accords with the teachings of the word of God. That alone is infallible. All Confessions are right in so far—and only in so far—as they agree with it and teach what it teaches. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isaiah 8 : 20). But, concerning the teach-

ings of the Sacred Scriptures upon the point under consideration, there can be no possible room for doubt. They are most explicit in declaring, both by example and precept, both by assertion and inference, that only he who has first been rightly called and inducted to the office of the ministry can, or dare with safety, assume the discharge of its functions. This is so repeatedly and specifically declared that it would be comparatively easy to fill pages with citations of passages, in the way of evidence; and a vastly harder task would be to quote even one instance where with divine approbation and blessing, men publicly proclaimed God's word or administered His ordinances unless they were first called and commissioned so to do. "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." (1 Cor. 14 : 33).

Moses did not of his own accord assume the office of lawgiver and leader of the people of Israel, but God called him to it when he spake to him out of the burning bush in the wilderness. (Ex. 3 : 10–18). Aaron entered the office of priest only when once he had received from the Lord, by the hands of Moses, his commission to enter upon it. "And the Lord said to Aaron, 'Go into the wilderness to meet Moses.' And he went, and met him in the mount of God, and kissed him. And Moses told Aaron all the words of the Lord who had sent him, and all the signs which He had commanded him." (Ex. 4 : 27–28). The Levitical Priesthood, also, was not a merely assumed human undertaking; but the tribe of Levi was separated by God Himself from all the other tribes, and, by special and solemn services of consecration, were devoted to their sacred duties. (Num. 3 : 5–13). The prophets, also, who were true prophets of God, were called and sent forth upon their prophetic mission, with clear and undeniable credentials. Some, it is true, at various times, assumed to prophesy in God's name, just as some do now, whom God did not send, and upon whom He denounces His severe displeasure. "I have not sent them, saith the Lord, yet they prophesy a lie in my name; that I might drive you out, and that ye might perish; ye, and the prophets that prophesy

unto you." (Jer. 27 : 15). But God's true prophets were all *called* to prophesy. God called, inspired, commissioned them. They ran because He sent them. Their message was the "burden of the Lord" to the people. And the people recognized them as thus being God's prophets—men filling a special office—and consecrated, with authority, to a separate and holy work. Thus was Samuel, the head of the prophetic college, directly called. "The Lord called Samuel and he answered 'Here am I.'" (1 Sam. 3 : 4). The "vision" which Isaiah saw and uttered, were visions which God revealed to him, and bade him make known. (Isaiah 1 : 1). Jeremiah's commission predates even his birth: "Then the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, 'Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee, and ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.'" (Jer. 1 : 4–5). The same is true, also, of all the prophets: they did not prophesy until they were called and moved by God to do so. And not only did God thus, under the old dispensation, throw a sanctity around the priestly and prophetic offices by specially calling and endowing men to fill them, but He declared this sanctity in a yet more impressive manner, namely by the sudden and fearful displays of His displeasure with which He, on several occasions at least, visited those who, without being called and separated to the work, irreverently assumed the functions of these offices. "Thou shalt appoint Aaron and his sons," said God to Moses, "and they shall wait on their priest's office; and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death." (Num. 3 : 10). When Miriam and Aaron murmured against Moses, and said, "Hath the Lord spoken only by Moses? hath He not spoken also by us?" the anger of the Lord was kindled against them, and when "the cloud departed from off the Tabernacle, behold Miriam was leprous white as snow." (Num. 12 : 1–10). The case, also, of King Uzziah is a striking one in proof of God's displeasure against those who dare to intrude themselves, uncalled, into the priestly or ministerial office. (2 Chron. 26 : 16–21). Very signally, also, did God display His displeasure against all unbidden or un-

called assumption of official and sacred duties, in the case of Uzzah, when the Ark was brought by David from Kirjath-jearim to Jerusalem. (2 Sam. 6 : 3–7). And similarly did He also show His anger against all such irreverent presumption when Jeroboam the son of Nebat, the wicked king who made Israel to sin, once stood by the Altar to burn incense. When the prophet denounced him for it, and he stretched out his hand to seize and punish the prophet, "his hand which he put forth against him, dried up so that he could not pull it in again to him." (1 Kings 12 : 1–4).

Examples, in proof of the position that only those who are rightly called should perform ministerial acts, abound also in the New Testament. The harbinger of the Messiah, John the Baptist, was "filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb," to go before the coming Redeemer in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just ; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." (Luke 1 : 15–17). The Seventy had their commission directly from the Master, and were sent by Him, "two and two, into every city and place whither He himself would come." (Luke 10 : 1). So especially were the Twelve called and ordained to their special office. "And He called unto Him the Twelve and began to send them forth by two and two." (Mark 6 : 7). "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain." (John 15 : 16). And so when Judas, one of these twelve, by transgression fell, his place, whether properly or not, was filled by the election of Matthias to the apostleship, thus showing at least that the Church of Jerusalem believed a "call" to the office necessary before assuming the duties of the office. St. Paul's call was a direct and miraculous one. The apostle Paul writing to Timothy, exhorts him "not to neglect the gift which was in him, which was given him by prophecy, and the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," (1 Tim. 4 : 14,) and, himself thus a called and ordained minister, he bids him ordain others to the same office, saying, "and the things that thou hast heard of me

among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2 : 2). And the same exhortation he addresses, also, to Titus, saying, "for this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city as I had appointed thee." (Tit. 1 : 5). The apostle, also, bids Timothy "lay hands suddenly on no man," *i. e.* not in too much haste to ordain any one to the work of the ministry, lest one not rightly or truly called would thus be inducted by him into the sacred office, who would do much harm, and Timothy himself would thus become partaker of his sins. (Tim. 5 : 22). Paul and Barnabas, also, in their missionary journey, not only confirmed the souls of the disciples, and exhorted them to continue in the faith, but they also, we read, "ordained them elders in every church," (Acts 14 : 23,) *i. e.* set apart by ordination certain chosen and qualified men as pastors of the churches. And, as the highest possible proof of the point under consideration, let us never forget that even our Saviour, although divine and possessed of an anointing for His official work from all eternity, yet did not enter upon it, or assume the public discharge of its functions, until He was first, by Baptism and the descent upon Him of the Holy Spirit, solemnly and visibly set apart to it and inaugurated into His messianic or ministerial office. (Matt. 3 : 13–17).

The Scriptures, however, teach this truth of the necessity of a call to the ministry by many specific precepts and inferences also. The Saviour, *e. g.*, in many of His parables, where the servants (ministers) are represented as being employed, directed, and rewarded by God as the Great Householder and the Lord of the Vineyard, thus teaches it. (*See Dr. Diehl's Essay*, *Lutheran Diet*, vol. 1, p. 266). The same is implied, also, in His exhortation to His followers to pray that men may be raised up, qualified and sent forth to labor in the Church as ministers: "Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that He will send forth laborers into His harvest." (Matt. 9 : 38). Above all the Saviour's commission to the Apostles, and to the ministry of all ages, teaches it.

"All power," He declares, "is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. 28 : 18–20). And the same is also repeatedly declared in the writings of the Apostles "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" (1 Cor. 12 : 28–30). "God hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation." (2 Cor. 5 : 18). "Let a man so account of us as the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God." (1 Cor. 4 : 11). And James (3 : 1) exhorts: "My brethren, be not many masters or teachers, (διδάσκαλοι), knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation;" *i. e.* let not many aspire to be religious teachers or guides to the Church, for not many are qualified or called to be, and only those who are qualified and called should be. Or, as Luther renders it: "Lieben brüder, unterwinde sich nicht yedermann Lehrer zu sein; und wisset das wir desto mehr Urtheil empfangen werden."

Beyond all possibility, then, in view of the passages which have now been cited, of honest doubt or refutation, it stands proven from the word of God that there is such a thing as a "*Call to the Ministry*," and that as this Article of our Confession teaches, "no man should publicly in the church, teach or administer the sacraments except he be rightly called," *i. e.* really has this right or regular call. Or, as St. Paul expresses it: "No man taketh" (*i. e.*, ought to take) "this honor unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron," (Heb. 5 : 4).

HARMONY OF THE ARTICLE WITH THE VIEWS OF LUTHER AND OF THE GREAT LUTHERAN DOGMATICIANS.

The views of Luther and of the great Lutheran dogmaticians are, of course, all in entire accord with the teachings of

this Article of our Confession which we are now considering. With one voice all assert the necessity of a "*rite vocatus*" before assuming the discharge of ministerial acts or duties. Luther, it is true, was charged by the Romanists with virtually, by his teachings, abrogating the ministerial office, and with breaking down all distinction between the ministry and the laity. But no charge ever preferred against the great Reformer was more utterly false and groundless.

Luther held that all Christians, in baptism, become priests, and are endowed with all the spiritual rights and duties of priests. But he made a distinction, for the sake of order, and in simple justice on the part of one toward others, between the *possession* of priestly rights and duties and the *exercise* of those rights and duties. The exercise of these priestly functions, he held, was a limited one by virtue of the fact that every Christian is a member of a communion, the Church. If every one, according to his own pleasure, where and whenever it may please him, should assume to perform his priestly duties, he would, by so doing, interfere with the rights of his fellow Christians, and would thereby bring about an injurious or destructive confusion in the Church. All individual Christians cannot, in the same manner, and at the same time, exercise the functions of their Christian priesthood toward others. This is simply impossible. And under ordinary or normal circumstances, where there is a church, it is also entirely unnecessary. The church or congregation, as an organic unit or whole, Luther held, is bound to preach the word of God, but she can, of course, do this only through individual persons whom she has thereto authorized and commissioned. These individual persons whom she thus authorizes and commissions, speak in her name and in her stead. She, the Church, speaks by the mouth of these individual persons who are her instruments. She, however, is really the person speaking.

Thus is there, according to this view, in the Church, and grounded in her very being, a *church-office*, viz. the office of the ministry. She cannot live without it. Where the Church is, there is, also, this office, and there also will its

functions be exercised. And each Christian in the exercise of the functions of the ministerial office, by those appointed by the Church thereto, sees the fulfilment of the command which makes the preaching of the gospel the duty of the entire Christian communion, as also his own individual duty. And thus, also, in the very nature of things, are there limits set to each Christian in the exercise of his priestly rights and duties beyond which, as one in a body where all have equal rights and duties, he neither need nor dare justly go.

Luther's words, in thus teaching that the ministerial office grounds itself in an obligation resting upon the Church as a whole, have been interpreted as if he rested the existence of the ministerial office wholly upon a voluntary contract, entered into between a certain number of Christians who, by mutual consent, conferred upon *one* of their number that which was the duty of *each* of them. This has been declared too slender a foundation upon which to rest the office, imperiling the very existence of the same. But, in supposing this to have been Luther's view of the office of the ministry, injustice is perhaps done him. Luther did, indeed, teach that in the official discharge of the duties of the ministry by those elected or ordained to the office, every Christian could and should see a discharge of his own duties, as one of the universal priesthood, and that he should recognize himself as having conferred upon the one officiating the exercise of his duty as far as it is a public or congregational duty. But in thus teaching, Luther by no means held that in this lay the *root* or *origin* of the office, as though it were created by or sprung merely from some such contract made by men. On the contrary, he clearly recognized the root of the office as one planted by God Himself. He knew that as the Church is before the individual Christian, so also is the office of the ministry, or all official action, before the action of the individual. He repeatedly asserts that the Church cannot be without the office; and it is not left to the option of individual Christians, be their number ever so great, whether or not there shall be an office. By their agreement they do not create the office, but they simply fill the office, already existing, with a

man of their choice. They simply make an office-bearer. The consecration by the bishop, Luther wrote to the German nobility, is nothing else than as if he, instead of and in the name of the whole assembly, took one of the number, all having inherently equal power or rights, and set him apart to exercise this power or right for the rest. Or, it is as if ten brothers, princes, equal heirs, should choose one of their number to administer the inheritance for them. The royal or princely right is there, and belongs to all; the administration of the same is, however, conferred upon one. The same is true of the office of the ministry and the election or appointment of men to fill the same. The office exists. It exists in the Church, in which, as equal spiritual priests, all Christians have equal priestly rights and duties, and some of whom the Church thus, out of her own number, chooses and sets apart to discharge for the rest the public priestly functions devolving inherently upon each and all. Hence, since the office is a permanent one in the Church, there remains no occasion for each individual Christian to exercise his priesthood in public teaching; nay, simply because there is such an office, and that office is filled by men whom the Church has specially appointed to the office, it becomes the duty of all not thus appointed to be silent and not assume thus to teach. From the very beginning of his work, Luther insisted upon it that only those thus called to the office of the ministry should discharge the duties of that office. He distinguished sharply between the right and the exercise of the right. All Christians, he taught, are priests, but all are not pastors. (*Vide Plitt's Einleitung in die Augustana*, vol. 2, pp. 370–72). "Either show," he indignantly writes to those assuming to teach without a call, "either show your call and command to preach, or keep silence and presume not to preach. For here an office is in question, yea an office of preaching. But an office no one can have without a command and call." (*Erlangen Ed.*, 31, 218). Again: "There must be bishops, pastors, or teachers, who publicly and specially administer the four things mentioned above, on account and in the name of the Church, but by the appointment of

Christ, as St. Paul says, Eph. 4 : 11. For the multitude cannot do this, but must commit it, or have it committed, to an individual. What would the consequence otherwise be, if each would speak and officiate, and none would give way to the other? It must be committed to one alone, and he alone must be permitted to preach. The rest must all hold their peace and consent to it." (*Erlangen Edition* 25, 364). And very emphatically does he repel the slanders of his enemies upon this point, in writing to Emser in 1521: "Thou sayest falsely that I make bishops, priests and pastors of all laymen, and teach that they may officiate without a call; and, holy as thou art, concealest the fact that I also write that no one should presume to administer the office without being called except in extreme necessity." (*Erlangen Edition* 27, 255. See, also, 39, 215–216).

No one, therefore, held more clearly and tenaciously to the necessity of a call to the ministry, before assuming the duties of the ministry, than Luther. If necessary, passage upon passage could be quoted in proof. (*Vide Dr. Walther's* "*Kirche und Amt*," pp. 174–187, also, *Prof. M. Loy*, "*The Ministry*," pp. 74–106).

Equally clear and emphatic in their utterances upon this point are all the leading dogmaticians of our Church since Luther's day. With unbroken unanimity they insist upon what our Article calls the "*rite vocatus.*"

Thus Chemnitz declares:

"All Christians are indeed priests (1 Pet. 2., Rev. 1), because they offer spiritual sacrifices to God. Each one also at his own home both can and should teach the word of God, (Deut. 6 : 7, 1 Cor. 14). Nevertheless it is not every Christian who should take upon himself the public ministry of the word and sacraments. For not all are apostles, not all are teachers, (1 Cor. 12 : 29) but those only who by a special and legitimate call from God, (*sed qui peculiari et legitima vocatione a Deo ad hoc ministerium segregati sunt*) are set apart to this ministry." (*Exam. Conc. Trid.* II. de s. ord. c. 1).

And again:

"It is certain from the word of God that in the Church no

one ought to be heard who has not been lawfully called. For Paul distinctly says, (Rom. 10 : 15) that they cannot preach, *i. e.* by right, even though they may actually attempt it, who have not been sent. And in (Jer. 23 : 21) God complains: 'I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran.' Indeed the churches ought not and cannot with any profit, hear those who have not testimonies of a lawful call." (*De Ecclesia.* 3, 119).

GERHARD says:

"We must distinguish between the *general* command and vocation, (*distinguendum enim inter generale mandatum et vocationem*) which all the pious receive when they are made Christians, * * * and the *special* vocation or call, (*et inter specialem vocationem*) by which the administration of the word and sacraments, in the public assembly of the Church, is, by the Church's public consent, entrusted to certain suitable persons, which vocation is not common to all Christians, as appears from 1 Cor. 12 : 29; Eph. 4 : 11; James 3 : 7." (*Loci. Theologici, De Ministerio Ecclesiastico*, Sec. 67).

QUENSTEDT says:

"When, in the Church properly established through the word, the regular or appointed ministers of the Church rightly discharge the duties of their office, it is permitted no one to enter the office of teaching without a legitimate call, but it is in every way necessary that each one be legitimately called and chosen, even a special calling is necessary in order to enter (rightly) the office of the ministry, so that, without it, it is permitted no one to teach publicly in the Church, and to administer the sacraments. Augs. Conf. Art. XIV., etc. (*Vide Quenstedt's Theologia Didactico Polemica, Pars Quarta*, Caput xii., Sectio ii. p. 397).

CARPZOV says:

"Access to the office of public instruction is granted to no one unless he has in due form been first called."

HUNNIUS says:

"No one who desires to be a minister of God ought to push himself into the office, but ought to be properly ordained for this purpose." (*Epitome Credendorum, Eng. trans.*, p. 240).

Hollazius, in answer to the question, "*Quid est Ministerium Ecclesiasticum?*" says:

"Ministerium Ecclesiasticum est officium sacrum et publicum divinitus institutum, et certis atque idoneis hominibus per legitimam vocationem commendatum, ut peculiari potestate instructi verbum Dei doceant, Sacramenta administrent, et disciplinam Ecclesiasticam conservent ad gloriam Dei, hominum que salutem promovendam." (*Vide Hollaz., Examen, de Min. Eccl. Pars* iv., Cap. 2, p. 859).

Thus, with one consent, do our great Lutheran theologians enforce this doctrine of the necessity of a call to the ministry, and thus do all repeat and emphasize the truth taught in our Article, viz., "that no man should publicly in the Church teach, or administer the Sacraments, except he be rightly called, or without a regular call."

And yet this discharge of ministerial duties is not, always and absolutely, to be limited only to those who, by a right call, have been placed in the ministerial office. The rule has its exception. Under certain special circumstances any Christian, even though he be not a minister, may and should exercise at least some of the functions of the ministry. From Luther down through the entire line of our Lutheran dogmaticians, it has by all been freely admitted and taught that, *in all cases of absolute necessity*, any Christian layman, and even any Christian woman, may preach the word, administer baptism, and pronounce absolution. This exception, like the rule itself, although, of course, for a very different reason, springs from the spiritual priesthood of each Christian. In the former case, or in the observance of the rule, as expressed in Article XIV. of our Confession, there is on the part of each individual Christian a *withholding* of the exercise of his priestly rights, out of regard to the equal priestly rights of his fellow Christians; and in the latter case, *i. e.* when in case of necessity, although not in the office of the ministry, he performs ministerial duties, he simply *resumes* the exercise of his rights, and he discharges those duties on the strength of his commission as one of the universal priesthood of believers.

And hence the *Appendix to the Smalcald Articles* says: "In case of necessity, a mere layman may absolve another, and become his pastor; as St. Augustine relates that two Christians were in a ship together, the one baptized the other, and afterward was absolved by him." (*Book of Concord, Eng. trans.*, p. 568).

LUTHER says:

"If a number of pious laymen were taken prisoners, and placed in a wilderness, without a priest consecrated by a bishop, and these agreed among themselves to elect one of their number, whether married or not, and commit to him the office of baptizing, administering the Eucharist, absolving and preaching, he would undoubtedly be a priest, as much so as if all bishops and popes had ordained him. Hence it is that, in case of necessity, every one can baptize and absolve, which would not be possible, if we were not all priests." (*Luther's Works, Erlangen Edition*, 21, 282).

GERHARD, L. T., (*De Min. Ecc.*, § 74):

"In a case of extreme necessity, when a man must either depart without baptism, or baptism must be administered by a private person, it is better that baptism be administered by a private person, than that the man should depart without baptism; nevertheless the administration of baptism ordinarily belongs to the ministers of the Church."

HOLLAZIUS, (*Examen Theologicum De Min. Ecc.*, q. viii., obs. 2):

"In the collecting and establishing of a Church, where there are not those present who, having been ordinarily called, may teach, nor any at hand to give a call, in this extreme case of necessity, where the glory of God and the salvation of our neighbors are alone to be regarded, we willingly grant that any Christian is bound to instil the catechetical milk of righteousness to those unskilled in speech."

Ib., (*De Baptismo*, q. iv.):

"Extraordinarily and in case of necessity, any pious Christian, whether male or female, acquainted with sacred rites, can administer baptism."

Ib., (*De Eucharista*, q. iv.):

"Not even in case of necessity, is the administration of the Holy Supper to be committed to a layman or private Christian; because there is a distinction in this respect between Baptism, which is a sacrament of initiation, and the Eucharist, which is a sacrament of confirmation. Concerning the necessity of Baptism Christ bears witness, (John 3 : 5). But the use of the Holy Supper has not been made of equal necessity; and therefore when there can be no recourse to the ordinary ministry, then the remark of Augustine is in place: 'Believe and thou hast eaten.'"

Thus in case of necessity, as Luther and all our theologians admit, may those *not* in the ministerial office, or those not having what our Article designates the "*rite vocatus*," perform ministerial acts. But let it be clearly observed that, where this is allowed, there must be a real and absolute necessity. In all other cases it is irregular and wrong for a layman to usurp the functions of the ministry. Where a minister is present, or where the presence and services of a minister could in any way be secured, there it is the minister alone who can rightly preach the word or administer the sacraments, and for a layman, there and under such circumstances, to attempt these duties is unwarranted presumption. Our great Luther in all that he wrote upon the priestly rights and duties of laymen, was nevertheless always most careful to guard jealously the distinctive prerogatives of the ministerial office, and he always strenuously asserted that there must be an actual and extreme *necessity* in order to justify a layman in publicly teaching in the Church or administering the sacraments. This belonged, not to the spiritual priesthood, but to the pastoral office. And only by those *in* the office, save in case of extreme necessity, shall these duties be discharged. "In einer Gemeinde," he writes, "da Jedem das recht frei ist, soll sich deselbigen niemand annehmen ohne der ganzen Gemeinde Willen und Erwählung; *aber in der Noth brauche sich deselbigen wer da will.*" (W. x. 1858). Again: "Niemand soll selbst sich des unberufen unterwinden *es wäre denn die äusserste Noth.*" (Walch, xviii., 1597). And

again, upon the supposition that the Christian is where there is no Church and no ordained ministry, and where all around him are perishing in sin, he writes: "In solchem Falle sieht ein Christ aus brüderlicher Liebe die *Noth* der armen verdorbenen Seelen an, und wartet nicht ob ihm Befehle oder Brief von Fürsten oder Bischöfen gegeben werde, *den Noth bricht alle Gesetze und hat kein Gesetz.*" (Walch, x. 1801–3).

Laymen being thus justified, in Luther's judgment, in the exercise of the functions of the office of the ministry, only in case of the most strenuous necessity, our whole modern system of lay evangelism or lay preaching finds no countenance whatever in his teachings; and, were he now living, above that of all others would his voice, in thunder tones, be raised against it, condemning it as unscriptural in principle and unprofitable and injurious in practice. Would it not be well, merely for the sake of consistency if for no other and higher reason, if those bearing the Lutheran name and boasting at times so loudly of their Lutheran relationship, were also to know more of Luther's sound and conservative views upon this whole subject and adhere more to his wise and judicious example with regard to it.

THE CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS OR FACTORS OF THE "RITE VOCATUS" AS REQUIRED BY THIS ARTICLE.

But what, let us now ask, is this "call to the ministry," or this "*rite vocatus*," which is thus demanded by our Article? What are its constituent elements? In what does it essentially consist?

1. *This right call to the ministerial office consists, first of all, in the possession of the needed ministerial gifts and qualifications.*

We may assume, as an *a priori* truth, that God *calls* no one into the office of the ministry whom He has not beforehand *qualified* for that office. Having revealed in His word what gifts and qualifications a true bishop or pastor must possess, He would, in the very nature of the case, call those only who possess the gifts and qualifications thus required. Besides, the ministry being pre-eminently a peculiar and special work,

in its very nature unlike all other vocations, and hence requiring special and peculiar gifts and endowments, fitting a man for it, and necessary in order to render him happy and successful in it, we must take it for granted that God, by the Holy Spirit, calls no one to this special work without also conferring upon him the gifts and qualifications necessary for it. The very fact, therefore, that an individual is possessed of the special gifts and characteristics, designated in the Sacred Scriptures as qualifications for the ministerial office, is at once, in itself, an indication that possibly God wills him to enter that office. The conferring of the gifts is, in part at least, the "call." It is a divine revelation of the divine will concerning him; an intimation to him from heaven of what his life mission should be; a true voice of God calling to him, out of the very depths of his being, saying: "This is the way which I have marked out for thee—walk thou in it." Thus, indeed, God, in part at least, indicates to *every* man his providential mission in life. The purpose of God with regard to every human being is that he should glorify Him and enjoy Him forever. And hence, in the natural or constitutional endowments already of each one, and in the providential orderings and spiritual experiences of his life afterward, God fits one human being thus to serve and glorify Him in one position or sphere of life, and another in a different position or sphere. And this providential designation of a man to a particular class of duties, or to some special employment or mode of life, is, on this very account, even in popular language, spoken of as his "calling." What a man is clearly and evidently *fitted* for, that, also, men say, he is *called* to; and what he has no qualification or endowment for, that, they say, he is not called to. And so emphatic is our intuitive recognition of this truth that God designates men to their work in life, by the very talents He confers upon them or withholds from them, that when a man succeeds in whatever he undertakes, men instinctively say: "he has found his calling;" or, if he fails, they say: "he has mistaken his calling." In either case there is the clear recognition of this invisible, yet most positive, thing designated the man's "*call-*

ing;" *i. e.* the will of God framing the man's being and fitting him for some certain and especial sphere or mission in life, and the man either reading that will, and falling in obediently with it, and, by doing so, making life a success, or not reading it, and perpetually going counter to it, and, in consequence, making a failure of life.

Especially, or in the highest and fullest possible sense, is all this true with regard to a man's calling of God into the office of the ministry. By the gifts God confers upon him, by the fitness for the work which in any way He bestows upon him, God calls him to the work, and makes it his duty to assume and discharge it. In that striking and beautiful simile which the apostle uses in his epistle to the Romans, he likens the Church to the complex human body, in which the members not only differ from one another, while each is essential to the whole, but the office and functions of each, also, are determined by their individual fitness for their respective offices and functions. "Having then," is his language, "*gifts* differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation." (Rom. 12 : 6–7). And, in his letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 12 : 4) he expressly refers these personal gifts to the Holy Ghost as their author, and declares their express object or design to be to qualify those who are so gifted for their personal and respective duties. "Now, there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man, to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit, the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another, the working of miracles; to another, prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another, divers kinds of tongues; to another, the interpretation of

tongues; but all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will."

As regards the office of the ministry, therefore, and as regards indeed all other offices and duties in the Church, these two points, from the word of God, are clear—viz. that the endowments or qualifications which men may possess for these respective offices, are the gifts to them of God, and that they express, both to their possessor and to others in the Church around him, that the will of God is that he upon whom He has thus bestowed such gifts should exercise them also in the especial office or duty for which he is thus especially fitted. Or, in other words, the divine endowment of a man for the ministerial office, constitutes essentially the divine "call," also, to that office; and the will of God that a man should be in the office is expressed by the peculiar fitness which He gives him for it.

What these especial gifts and endowments, thus qualifying a man for the office of the ministry, and thus making it his duty to enter it and labor for God's glory in it, are, the word of God, as also the experience of the Church, clearly reveal. They divide themselves into three classes, viz. suitable natural endowments both of body and of mind, suitable training and education or discipline and development of these natural endowments, and then, as the crown of all, suitable spiritual qualifications, or the possession, in an eminent degree, of the fruit and unction of the Holy Spirit, sanctifying and consecrating both the natural endowments and the educational acquirements to the single and supreme object of glorifying God. The first, therefore, is the bestowal of God in creation, the second in providence, and the third in grace; each His gift, and each necessary to fit a man for the office. The "call" implies and includes them all.

There must, first, be the necessary natural endowments both of body and of mind. There must be proper *bodily* qualification. It is extremely doubtful whether God calls a man with a defective or unhealthy body into the office of the ministry. Under the Old Testament no man who was maimed or blemished in any of

his bodily members was allowed to enter the priest's office. "Speak unto Aaron saying, Whosoever he be of thy seed in their generation that hath any blemish, let him not approach to offer the bread of his God. For whatsoever man he be that hath a blemish, he shall not approach: a blind man, or a lame, or he that hath a flat nose, or anything superfluous, or a man that is broken-footed, or broken-handed, or crooked-backed, or a dwarf, or that hath a blemish in his eye, or be scurvy or scabbed; no man that hath a blemish of the seed of Aaron the Priest shall come nigh to offer the offerings of the Lord made by fire; he hath a blemish; he shall not come nigh to offer the bread of his God." (Lev. 21 : 17–21). Of course I do not here forget that this requirement of bodily perfection existed in the office of the *priesthood*, and under the *Old* Dispensation, which was largely typical, and that the office concerning whose "call" we are speaking, is the office of the ministry under the *New* or Gospel Dispensation. And yet I also remember that in each of these Old Testament requirements we have an expression, not simply of the divine will concerning the special thing to which the requirement applies, but an expression also of that will concerning the general subject or object with which that special requirement stands related or connected. The thing specific under the Old Dispensation was the order of the priesthood, and the thing specific under the New Dispensation is the office of the ministry, but in both the thing general is public divine worship, and who shall be the official ministers or functionaries of that worship. A physical disqualification under the one dispensation, therefore, would, it seems to me, be equally a disqualification under the other dispensation.

But, apart from what the word of God may thus teach upon this subject, the duties and demands of the ministerial office are such that the successful and uninterrupted prosecution of it imperatively requires *bodily* soundness and vigor of a high order. Men, in feeble health, and of frail physical constitution, like Baxter and Doddridge and Summerfield, have, of course, been eminently useful in the work of the

ministry. And yet, with health and bodily strength, how much more useful they would have been. How much work for Christ and souls, because of their limited strength, was necessarily left undone. How much, for the same reason, was feebly and unsatisfactorily done. And in how many such cases of feeble health, when the Church perhaps expended her means in educating the man for the ministry, and when he has perhaps barely entered upon it, he soon becomes utterly incapacitated, is compelled to relinquish his work, and speedily sinks into the grave. A sound, vigorous, healthful body is, then, an essentially important natural endowment which all who seek the office and work of the ministry should possess.

The same is true, even in a higher degree, of the *mental* endowments and capacities of those seeking this sacred office. These should always be of an high order. The ministry is a work which requires, in the nature of the case, a strong, vigorous mind. It demands a high order of native intellect. He is not called to the ministry whose capacity of thought, whose original endowments of reason and understanding, are not above the capacities and endowments with which men generally are by nature gifted. The minister is to be the student and interpreter to the people of God's word, he is to be the leader of religious thought, he is to originate and mould public sentiment, he is to be the teacher and instructor of society, he is to be the head and governor of the church of which the Holy Ghost shall make him the overseer. Can such a position be properly filled by a man of ordinary mental power? Does not the full and successful discharge of such high duties demand also the possession of a high order of talent? Men of comparatively feeble natural ability have, I am aware, in spite of their feebleness, in some instances, been extensively useful; but even these, it must be admitted, often owe their usefulness more to certain favorable surroundings and helps than to their own personal endeavors. Besides, their usefulness is generally limited to certain peculiar localities, and to a certain class of minds and range of society of their own level, or even below their own level,

but ceases, or is greatly diminished, when they are transferred to other and more cultured and thoughtful communities. And yet the Saviour bids His ministry to make the *world* their field, and hence requires that they should be fitted also to labor with success in any part of it.

The "call" to the office of the ministry includes, then, suitable natural endowments, both of body and of mind. Completeness and health of body; vigor and strength of mind; quickness and grasp in apprehension; soundness of judgment; stability in purpose; attractiveness in person; affability in address and manner; readiness and force in utterance; born leadership in the character of his whole being, both of body and mind; these are some of the gifts which God, in his very creation already, bestows upon the man whom He calls into the office of the ministry.

But, beside these *natural* endowments, which are the gifts of God by creation, there are, also, conferred upon all whom He calls into the ministerial office, *the additional endowment, secondly, of suitable education and training, or the discipline and development, by culture, of the mental capacities bestowed by creation.* Natural gifts alone are insufficient to meet fully, especially in this our day and land, the demands which are made upon the ministry. There must also be the additional endowment of culture, the development, the training, the discipline of the mental faculties into their highest possible measure or capacity of usefulness. Scholarship as well as talent, education as well as genius, attainments as well as endowments, are required by all who would be workmen in the office of the ministry, not needing to be ashamed, able rightly to divide the word of God. This has always been so. Moses, although naturally possessed of the highest order of genius, was nevertheless "learned, also, in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." (Acts 7 : 22). The Apostles were during three years under the personal tuition of the Saviour Himself before they were sent forth upon their ministerial work. Paul, the most useful of the Twelve, was also the best educated of the Twelve. "A well educated ministry of religion, has always been the ordinance of heaven,

from the earliest records of history to the present hour. The educational provisions of the tribe of Levi, the schools of the prophets, the scribes and doctors of the law among the Jews, the personal training which Christ gave His apostles, the celebrated schools of the early Church, and the Universities and Colleges of later and present ages, all of which were expressly founded and designed for the suitable education of ministers, and often in the face of almost incredible difficulties, bear a most remarkable and unbroken testimony to the settled judgment of the Church, on this point, in all its dispensations." (*Considerations on a Call to the Ministry*, by the Rev. Dr. M. B. Hope, Prof. in the College of New Jersey). There have of course been some uneducated men, who have yet been useful men. But such men are exceptions to the rule. God can, we admit, make an illiterate and uneducated man successful in the preaching of the word. With Him all things are possible. Even a dumb ass, if He wills it, can be so made to speak that a prophet himself, sitting upon it is instructed by it. But that does not prove that He wants only dumb asses to be His ministers. He may sometimes, for special reasons, depart from His general order or rule, and He may sometimes make ignorance serve His purpose, but if He does, He does it in spite of the ignorance, and by other factors beside and above the ignorance. God never uses ignorance itself as an element of ministerial success. God calls no man into the ministry *because* he is uneducated and ignorant. If such a man does find his way into the ministry, and chances to be useful, he is so despite his lack of education and despite his ignorance; and he would, under the same circumstances, if he were not ignorant, be vastly more useful. In all the past ages of the Church, the men who have risen to the highest measures of usefulness, who have impressed themselves upon their generations for good, whose influence survived them and moulded the thought and life of generations following, were educated men. And, if in any age in the world's history, God called only cultured and intelligent men into the office of the ministry, He does

so now, in our age. Ours is an age of more than ordinary intelligence among the masses, an age of intense mental activity, an age of inquiry and investigation, an age of skeptical assault upon the very foundations of Christianity, an age in which unsanctified genius and scholarship are massed in deadly hostility against every essential doctrine of our most holy faith. At such a time especially, therefore, is a talented and learned ministry an absolute necessity. Now, when liberty all over our land is tending to licentiousness, and when infidelity and every possible system of false religion, are stalking abroad and are impudently challenging the credentials and faith of the believer, it would surely be more than folly, it would be a crime to entrust the defence and propagation of the faith to any other class of men than men of clear, strong, well-trained, and well-furnished minds. Now, more than ever, the Church demands a ministry which will "hold fast the faithful word, and be able, by sound doctrine both to exhort and convince the gainsayers; for there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." (Tit. 1:9–11). Now, more than ever, God calls only men possessed of thorough mental training into the office and work of the ministry. The "*rite vocatus*" never did include, and does not now include, the factor of ignorance.

And hence, also, our *Formula of Government and Discipline* very properly requires of all candidates for the ministry that their "examination shall embrace *at least* the following subjects, viz.: "Personal Piety, and the motives of the applicant for seeking the holy office; the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures; the Evidences of Christianity; Natural and Revealed Theology; Church History; Pastoral Theology; The Rules of Sermonizing; and Church Government." This is as it should be. So much, at least, should in every case, be required. It is, however, greatly to be regretted that this requirement of our "*Formula*," moderate as it is, is not always in our Synods enforced. In some of our Synods it is most flagrantly disregarded. Men from the ministry of other

churches in which theological and scientific training for the ministry is not pretended, are slipped into the ranks of our ministry as easily and quickly as though we pretended to such training as little as the churches from which such applicants come. And men, from the membership of our own Church, with scarcely an education sufficient to secure them an appointment as teachers in the common schools of our land, are yet, by the solemn "laying on of the hands of the presbytery," received into the ministerial office, and sent forth as the accredited teachers of the Church of Christ. Like the conies, such men, send them where you will, are "a feeble folk." They are not called of God to the ministry. They cannot, in the nature of the case, wield an influence such as the ministry should command for good. They are objects of indifference to the masses, and of contempt to the thoughtful and intelligent, wherever they go. They degrade, in public estimation, the ministerial office; they weaken the influence of Christianity, whose representatives and defenders they assume to be; and they prove an injury and not a blessing to the Church whose interests they have thus entrusted to them. By no possible stretch of charity can we believe that such men have the "*rite vocatus*," or the true call from God to enter the office of the ministry, and should never, therefore, be admitted into it. And hence, in order to correct this evil, our General Synod owes it to the Church, as a simple matter of self-protection, and owes it to the cause of Christ as a simple matter of justice and of right, to insist upon the enforcement, to the very letter, of the requirements, in this respect, of her own "*Formula*," and by the establishment of the same high standard of qualifications for admission in all her District Synods, and the establishment of better inter-synodical agreement and comity, so that whatever will exclude a man from admission into the ministry in one of our Synods will equally do so in every other, make it absolutely impossible for men, illiterate and unqualified, to receive licensure or ordination at her hands.

There is, however, another kind of training for the ministry beside this culture of the mind or training in the schools,

which is a very important qualification, and very necessary in order to a man's greatest possible influence. I refer to the culture of personal habits; the training which will give to a man the ease and bearing of a thoroughly refined Christian gentleman. The minister is capable, if fitted for it, to wield an immense *social* influence and power. He can, by his taste and accomplishments, by his ease and grace in society, by his attractive air and manner, by the winning and pleasing social qualities which he possesses, make himself a desirable and ever welcome guest in every home in the community, can draw all with whom he thus comes in contact to himself, can especially win the young as his admirers and friends, and can thus gain a power for good which will be almost boundless. For, after all, as ministers we reach men, if we reach them at all, by this very thing of what we are to them personally and in the plane of our social relations to them. By this they are either repelled or attracted. By this they are either prepared or unprepared to be benefitted by our public ministrations to them. And yet how many ministers there are whose training for their position is, in this respect, lamentably defective. It is a very delicate subject upon which to speak, and yet it may as well be spoken, but are there not men in the ministry of every Church, possessed of fine natural ability, of able scholarship, and of undoubted piety, who nevertheless, simply because of their lack of social culture, their uncouthness, their boorishness, their coarseness, their lack of ease and grace in good society, their destitution of the refinement and taste, the self-possession and unaffected affability and suavity which always characterize a man as a gentleman, cut themselves off from the influence for good which they would otherwise command, and fail to reach and win for Christ many whom otherwise they would reach and win? Looking at such men, the question has often forced itself upon my mind, Is there not something defective in our system of training for the ministry which neglects a factor of ministerial usefulness so important? Do we not in our Ministeriums, when men present themselves before us for induction into the sacred office, inquire too

little into their fitness for the work, by this characteristic of their social qualifications? Are such men, after all, really called of God into the ministry? Does He want them there? Have they, indeed—ought they to have—the "*rite vocatus?*" Moses was not only a man of great learning, but he was a man, also, of courtly and refined manners. Paul constantly reveals himself to have been a thorough and elegant gentleman. Our Saviour must have been very easy and winning in His social intercourse and relations, else the common people would not, as they did, have heard Him gladly; else the multitude would not have gathered so eagerly and intimately around Him on every possible occasion; else He would not have been invited to dine, as He often was, in the house of proud Pharisees; else He would never have been the frequent and most welcome visitor in the house of Martha and Mary and Lazarus that He was. "Be courteous," is a scriptural injunction addressed to all Christians. Is it not especially addressed to ministers? Can we be as useful as the office of the ministry demands that we should be, without it? Does God call a man into the ministry who is thus socially unqualified for the ministry? These questions might, with profit, be pondered by many.

Among the gifts, however, necessary above all others for the work, and without which God calls no one to the office of the ministry, is the gift of eminent personal piety.

The validity of ministerial acts, it is true, does not depend upon the personal or subjective moral character of him who performs the acts. The sacraments, *e. g.*, have in themselves an inherent or objective efficacy. The word of God is still the word of God even though proclaimed by one who has never experienced its power in his own heart. "Although," says our Augsburg Confession, (Art. VIII.) "the Christian Church is properly nothing else than the congregation of all believers and saints, yet, as in this life there are many hypocrites and false Christians, open sinners remaining even among the pious, the sacraments, nevertheless, are effectual, even if the preachers by whom they are administered be not pious, as Christ Himself says, (Matt. 23 : 2) "the Scribes and Phar-

isees sit in Moses' seat." And the *Apology*, (*De Ecclesia*, Art. VII. et VIII.) says: "Nor are the sacraments without efficacy because administered by unworthy and ungodly men; for they stand before us by virtue of the call of the Church, not on their own authority, but as representatives of Christ, who says, (Luke 10:16): "He that heareth you heareth Me. Thus Judas was also sent to preach. Now, although ungodly men preach and administer the sacraments, they officiate in Christ's stead. And this declaration of Christ teaches us that, in such cases, the unworthiness of the servant should not offend us."

And yet, whilst all that the Confessions thus teach is true, and whilst an ungodly man's ministerial acts may, notwithstanding his personal unworthiness, result in some measure of good because of what the word and sacraments are in themselves, nevertheless it is also true that God never *calls* ungodly men into the office of the ministry, nor, if they thrust themselves uncalled into it, does He ever crown their labors with great or extensive spiritual results. God calls no one into the ministry whom he has not first called to be a Christian. Have whatever else he may, if he has not eminent personal piety, he has not the right call to the ministry. "God qualifies men for the office," says Dr. Wayland, "by making them disciples of Christ, His renewed and obedient children, heirs of everlasting life. We can never suppose that God would employ men who are His enemies, in rebellion against Him, to persuade others to be reconciled to Him; that is, to do what they steadfastly refuse to do themselves. Unless a man have within himself the evidence that he has been born again, he has no right to enter the ministry. And, on the other hand, unless a man give evidence, by a Christian life, that he is in heart a true disciple of Christ, no body of believers can without sin call him to the ministry." (*Wayland, The Ministry of the Gospel*, pp. 27–28). "The first evidence," says another writer, "of a call to this high and holy office is genuine piety. An elevated tone of piety, experimental and practical, consistent and controlling, active and glowing, is an essential requisite, absolutely indispensable

to the faithful discharge of its appropriate duties. All the directions of inspiration enjoin or presuppose a pious heart, renewed by the Holy Ghost, baptized with the spirit of Jesus Christ, and brought completely under the sanctifying influences of Divine truth. To the minister of the Gospel are entrusted most momentous and solemn interests. He is commissioned to make known to men

> "The eternal counsels, in his Master's name
> To treat with them of everlasting things,
> Of life, death, bliss and woe."

It is preposterous to expect a man to communicate, expound, enforce and apply the truths of the Bible, who has never felt their power in his own heart, who neither understands, believes nor loves them. How shall he testify of the sufficiency of the remedy proposed in the Gospel unless he feel his own spiritual malady? How shall he awaken the careless sinner, if he himself is lulled into security? How shall he feed the flock of Christ, purchased with His precious blood, who has no interest in that purchase? How can he relieve the tempted, sympathize with the children of sorrow, bind up the broken-hearted, and comfort them that mourn, who has no experimental knowledge and no spiritual experience? How shall he who has never realized, and, therefore, never felt, the pressure of his own sins, present the word "fitly spoken" to distressed and heavy laden souls? How can he give to every one his portion in due season? How can he guide anxious and doubting souls? How can he show to the weary traveler the road which he himself has never traveled? The men, then, who fill the ministerial office, must be men of eminent piety; men of burning and untiring zeal; men whose hearts glow with the love of Christ; men full of faith and of the Holy Ghost; men who will not hesitate to do anything or suffer anything for Christ; men who will forsake even the comforts of refined society, and the endearments of home, and with their lives in their hands, go forth to the destitute settlements in our own country, or to the distant heathen, to preach the glad tidings of redemption to perishing sinners.

The ministry adapted to the present state of the Church and of the world, must be characterized by a broken spirit before God, compassion for the souls of others, and an unction from the Holy Ghost. The piety needed must be so consistent and controlling, as to constantly influence the feelings and passions, the desires and volitions, the daily habits and enterprises of the individual. It must be so elevated and deep toned as to pervade the soul, sweeten the temper, and lead daily to the faithful examination of the heart and to the entire consecration of the life to God." (Ev. Review, Vol. xii., pp. 199–200).

But, to sum up, and to show you in the clearest and fullest light, what the character and piety are of a man fitted for the ministerial office, and truly called of God into it, let me yet quote the words of an old author who was himself the highest human realization of a true Gospel minister that the world and the Church have ever seen. He writes as follows: "This is a true saying, if a man desire the office of a bishop (ἐπισκοπῆς) he desireth a good work. A bishop, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous, not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." (1 Tim. 3 : 1–7). And let me also yet, in order to show you the godly spirit in which this grandest of human preachers prosecuted the work of the ministry, read you a quotation from a farewell discourse which he delivered when he resigned the pastorship of the Church at Ephesus. "Ye know," is his language, "from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons, serving the Lord with all humility of mind, and with many tears and temptations which befell me by the lying in wait of the Jews: and how I kept back nothing that was profitable to you, but have showed you and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews

and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men; for I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." (Acts 20 : 18–27).

Such now, in their three-fold character of natural endowment, of acquired culture, and of bestowed Christian character and grace, are the gifts which, according to God's word, and as taught by the experience of the Church, must be possessed, and always are possessed, by those who are the called of God to the office of the Gospel Ministry. The "*rite vocatus*" of our Article includes them all, and he who has not these "*gifts*" from God has not the "*call*" from God.

It should hardly be necessary to add, and yet it is, that the *subjects* or *persons* whom God thus, by the bestowal of this fitness for its duties, calls to the office of the ministry are always *men* and *not women*. In His word He emphatically forbids women to speak or preach in the churches of the saints. "Let your women keep silence in the churches," is His clear and unmistakable command, "for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And, if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the Church." (1 Cor. 14 : 34–35). And again: "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection; but I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence; for Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression." (1 Tim. 2 : 11–14). Thus does God in His word, plainly and positively forbid women to preach. Would He then now "*call*" them to what He has thus forbidden them to do? Besides, is not woman, in the very constitution of her physical being, and especially in the formation of her vocal organs and capacities, unfitted for the work of preaching the word? Are not, also, the very instincts of her being, the innate modesty, the retiring diffidence of the nature with which God has en-

dowed her, and which constitute both her charm and her power, all of which she must first do violence to before she can bring herself into willingness to assume a work so public and conspicuous, an abiding protest against it? Is it not all as Horace Bushnell well styles it, "a reform against nature?" Is it not all in direct conflict with the divine purposes concerning woman as revealed in the Scriptures? "I will therefore," says God in His word, "that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." (1 Tim. 5 : 14). Just as some Christian *men*, because disqualified and incapable rightly to discharge its duties, are not called of God to the office of the ministry, so, for the same reason, together with the additional reason that God wills woman to glorify Him, in the specific domain of home, no woman is called to the office of the ministry. (*Luther's Works, Erlangen Ed., Vol.* 28, p. 50).

2. *The "rite vocatus," or the right call to the ministerial office, consists in a clear and heartfelt conviction, wrought by the Holy Ghost in the individual's own consciousness, that it is the will of God that he should enter that office and labor in it for the divine glory.*

I purposely here make use of the word "*conviction*," meaning by it the voice of conscience, and an inner and imperative sense of duty. A mere *preference* of the office and work of the ministry to any other vocation or calling in life; a mere *consent*, under the persuasion of friends, or because of the force of favorable circumstances, to enter it; a strong *desire* even, considered in itself alone, to fill that sacred position; all these are not sufficient evidences in themselves of a divine call. All these may exist, and the man still not be rightly called. The right inner call is something very different. It is more than mere willingness, or preference, or desire, or strong inner impulse. It springs purely from the domain of conscience. It comes with the force and dignity of an ethical imperative; a supreme moral obligation; an overwhelming and ineradicable sense of duty; all that, in its deepest and fullest sense, is expressed by the word *ought*. Many falsely regard themselves as possessing the divine call simply

because they *feel* moved to become ministers, without, for a moment, inquiring into the origin or moral character of their feelings. The mere fact that they have, no matter to them how it has been awakened, a *desire* to preach, is to them proof abundant that they are also *called of God* to do so. This desire, they assume, could have been awakened in them by the Holy Ghost only; and can be nothing less than the voice of the Holy Ghost saying to them that they are chosen of God to the work. As was noticed in the early part of our lecture this was the notion concerning the call to the ministry which was held by the Anabaptists, and by other fanatics, in the days of the Reformation. It was the theory also of the entire School of Mystics. It is the theory which is now held by the Friends or Quakers. And it is the theory, also, upon which, in all our different Protestant Churches, we too much proceed in determining the question whether or not a man is divinely called to the ministerial office. "Do you *feel* yourself called to preach the Gospel," is by many made the chief or decisive question; and, if the candidate declares that he does thus feel, the matter is already largely settled. The candidates, own subjective impressions concerning himself are regarded as a kind of holy of holies into which it would be irreverent or possibly criminal for any, with doubts and questionings, to enter. And many a young man decides to study for the ministry, and education societies decide to support him, and Theological Seminaries decide to receive him, and Synods decide to license or ordain him, and churches decide to elect him, not primarily, as they all should, because he possesses such scripturally defined ministerial gifts and graces as indicate the will of God in the case, but largely, if not sometimes altogether, simply because he declares that he feels himself inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to enter the ministry.

It is scarcely necessary to say that all this is very wrong. This exaltation of a mere subjective impression, or a mere desire, into an unquestionable and infallible oracle or expression of the divine will, has put many a man into the office

of the ministry whom God did not call there, and whose induction into it resulted unhappily to himself and injuriously to the Church.

The mere desire to become a minister, is, in itself, no proof of a divine call. That desire may be born of ignorance, or of vanity, or of ambition, or of indolence and love of ease, or of mere morbid excitement, or of regard to the wishes of others. It may spring from a thousand unsanctified and selfish sources. There may not be a single divine influence or factor of grace in it. In proof of this, how frequently is it not the case, and especially in times of religious awakenings, that young men feel inwardly moved or "called" to seek the office of the ministry who most clearly have no fitness whatever for it, and who in a comparatively brief time, not only lose the desire which they had for the ministry, but lose often their very profession of piety and again go back into the world and into sin. How many, also, are there not to-day, in the office who, by their inefficiency and perpetual lack of success, show, beyond a doubt, no matter how strong may have been their feeling or desire for it, that that feeling or desire was not wrought in them by the Holy Ghost, and that they ran without having been divinely called or sent. On the other hand, also, how often is it not the case that those who are evidently most fitted for the ministry, and who are most clearly called of God into it, have yet but little or no desire to enter it, and who, if they do enter it, do so at a sacrifice of their own personal predilections or preferences, and only from a deep-seated and solemn sense of obligation or duty. They are men in whose eyes the ministry is an office of the highest possible sanctity and responsibility, and for the right discharge of whose duties they feel themselves both utterly unworthy and incapable. And hence, as the will of God is more and more clearly revealed to them, and the conviction grows upon them that they are indeed divinely called to be ambassadors for Christ, there is within them an instinctive moral shrinking back from it, a pleading with God to be exempted from the assumption of such mighty responsibilities, and an asking tremblingly: "Lord, who am I that

Thou shouldst send me?" Thus Moses, and Jonah, and Jeremiah, were all without an "inner call" to their work, in the sense of a burning and irrepressible desire for it, and each of them assumed it only because God made it clear to their understanding and conscience that it was their duty to assume it. Neither of them *wanted* to be a minister of God. If left to their own personal preference and choice not one of them would have been what they were called of God to be. "Oh, my Lord," was the plea of Moses, "I am not eloquent neither heretofore nor since Thou hast spoken to Thy servant, but I am slow of speech and of a slow tongue." (Exodus 4 : 10). "Ah, Lord God," cried Jeremiah, when the Lord came to him, calling him to his prophetic work, "behold I cannot speak, for I am a child." (Jer. 1 : 6). And, when "the word of the Lord came to Jonah, the son of Amittai, saying: Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city and cry against it, for their wickedness is come up before me," Jonah, instead of desiring the work thus divinely assigned him, "rose up to flee to Tarshish from the presence of the Lord, and went down to Joppa; and he found a ship going to Tarshish: so he paid the fare thereof, and went down into it, to go with them unto Tarshish, from the presence of the Lord." (Jonah 1 : 1–3). Or, as Bishop Simpson, in his Yale Lectures, correctly says: "There is not an instance in the Holy Writ where a true man was ever anxious to bear the divine message. He always shrank from it, hesitated, and trembled."

The existence, therefore, of a desire for the office of the ministry, even in a strong degree, is, in itself, no conclusive proof of a divine call. Such desire may exist where God has not spoken. Satan himself may, indeed, be its author; even as St. Paul teaches, when he says: "For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel, for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness, whose end shall be according to their works." (2 Cor. 11 : 13–15). And how, it might here pertinently be

asked, *could* Satan use a man to greater advantage in hindering and injuring the Church and cause of Christ than simply by calling him, if bad, or even only weak and unqualified, into the responsible office of the ministry? How intensified, when once in the ministry, his influence for harm and evil!

This inner call of God, the subjective impression made by the Holy Ghost, the "*rite vocatus*" from above, and not from beneath, is not, then, a mere sentiment or emotion, no mere desire or impulse, no mere preference or persuasion, but it is a calm, rational conviction of duty. It grounds itself in the personal conscience. It is begotten by the Spirit of God in the sacred retreat of the individual consciousness. It is the deep-seated sense of the soul that it is the will of God that it should seek to enter the office. It is wholly what *God* wills in the matter, and not what the man *himself* wills. It is, in a word, the conviction, rising up in his consciousness into certainty, that God has qualified, or will qualify, him for the work of preaching the Gospel, and calls him to it; and that, no matter what *his* choice of a life-work might have been, *God's* choice for him is the ministry, and that only at the very peril of his soul's salvation can he decline to do what God thus bids him do. At first, indeed, this conviction may be very faint. He comes probably into this consciousness of what is his duty gradually. As he contemplates the perishing condition of the world, as he prays from day to day "thy kingdom come," as he reads more and understands better the word of God, as he learns better what are the scriptural qualifications necessary for the ministry, as he studies and knows himself more and finds that God has conferred these needed gifts even upon him, as he has suggested to him by others the thought that possibly God desires him in the ministry, as he grows in strength of Christian character and in willingness in any and every way possible to glorify God, and especially as he submits himself more and more to be guided and used by God in whatever service He may choose for him, and prays to have in all things no will but God's will, as he does all this, the conviction that he is called of God to the office of the ministry dawns upon him, grows on him, expands

gradually into greater clearness and positiveness, settles down, at last, upon his conscience as a sure call from God, and causes him, in the spirit of loving obedience and of filial subjection, to say as said Isaiah the prophet, "Here am I, send me," (Isaiah 6 : 8), or as said Paul, the apostle, "Necessity is laid upon me, yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel." (1 Cor. 9 : 16).

And thus is there in every true call to the ministry, not as constituting in itself the call, but simply as a precursor or concomitant of it, and moral means of preparation for it, this conviction in the subject himself that he is called of God to the work. This it is that moves him humbly to present himself to the Church, whose is the power of the keys, for her judgment in his case, and to receive at her hands the outward or true call. And hence in the Episcopal Church, in the ordination of deacons, the bishop demands of the candidate, "*Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministry, to serve God for the promotion of His glory and the edifying of His people?*" And the candidate must answer, "*I trust so.*" In the ordination service of our own Church, the candidate is asked, "*Do you believe that in seeking the ministerial office, you are influenced by a sincere love to God your Saviour, and desire to promote His glory.*" (*Formula*, chap. xix., sec. 2, 4).

In harmony, also, with all this are the views of our great Lutheran dogmaticians. For, whilst they are always most emphatic in their condemnation of an "inner call," in the fanatical and unscriptural sense in which it was held by the Anabaptists, Schwenkfeldians, Weigelians, Quakers, and others, denying the need of any outward call by the word and the Church, and making this subjective impulse in itself the supreme and the only necessary call, they nevertheless admit and clearly teach that there is such a thing as an inner inspiration or divinely wrought impression, in the consciousness of those whom God has gifted or qualified for the ministerial office, moving them to seek entrance into it, and causing them to feel that by laboring faithfully in it they will be able to do most for His glory.

Gerhard, *e. g.*, (*De Min. Ecc.*, sec. 75) says:

"We grant that God, by an inner impulse and inspiration, breathes into some this disposition to undertake the ministry of the Church, without regard to dangers or difficulties; to which belongs, also, that mysterious impulse by which some are drawn to the study of theology. We also grant that it is absolutely required of the minister that he be not allured either by ambition, or avarice, or any other wicked desire, but that induced by the pure love of God, and the desire of edifying the Church, he should accept the ecclesiastical office offered him; and if any one desire to apply, in a proper sense, the name of secret call to these dispositions, both of which are especially worthy of praise, we do not greatly object. Yet, in the meantime, we give the warning, that, in order that the doors be not opened to the disturbances of the Anabaptists, or the revelations of the enthusiasts, no one, by reason of this secret call, ought to take upon himself the duties of the ministerial office, unless there be added to it the outward and solemn call of the Church."

Chemnitz (iii., p. 119) on 1 Tim. 3 : 1, says:

"To desire the office of a bishop is not without a lawful call to take upon yourself ministerial functions; but he who understands the foundations of heavenly doctrine, and is to a certain extent endowed with the gift of teaching, in offering his labor to God and the Church, by this very act, seeks for nothing else than that God, by a lawful call, may declare whether, when, and where He wishes to use his ministry in the Church. And such a one ought to be endowed with such a mind, that, if a lawful call would not follow this petition, he would not take it upon himself, but would say with David (2 Sam. 2 : 26), 'But, if He thus say I have no delight in thee, behold, here am I, let Him do to me as seemeth good unto Him.'"

In the "*rite vocatus*," or the regular call to the ministerial office, as demanded by this Fourteenth Article of the Augsburg Confession, there is, then, a subjective impression, or inner conviction, wrought by the Holy Ghost in the conscience of the individual, moving him to seek the office, and

anointing him, as it were, beforehand with spiritual fitness for it, but which nevertheless is not in itself the call, and is not his true and final divine commission to preach the word and to administer the sacraments, or to assume and discharge the duties of the ministerial office. That true divine call is given, not thus directly and immediately, but indirectly and mediately through the Church to which Christ has delegated this power. Hence:

3. *The "rite vocatus," or the right call to the ministerial office, in its essential and highest form of expression, consists in the official recognition by the Church, in her exercise of the power of the keys, of the possession on the part of the person seeking the office, of those special gifts and graces required in the word of God as qualifications for the office of the ministry, and the public and solemn induction of him, by the rite of ordination, because of his possession of such special gifts and graces, into the ministerial office.*

In Article VII. of our Confession, the Church is defined to be "the congregation of all believers, among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity, and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel." (See, also, *Apology* VII.)

To the Church, thus defined, belongs the right of calling into the ministerial office. This right to "call" is hers, because to her has been committed by the Saviour the "Power of the Keys," (*Potestas Clavium*). "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. 16 : 19). "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John 20 : 23).

What this "power of the keys" is, we find admirably explained in our Confessions. The Augsburg Confession, (Art. XXVIII., *Of the Power of the Bishops or Clergy*), says: "Accordingly they teach that the power of the keys or of the bishops, according to the Gospel, is a power and commission from God to preach the Gospel, to remit and to retain sins, and

to attend to and administer the sacraments. For Christ sent forth the Apostles with the command: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." This power of the keys, or of the bishops, is to be exercised and carried into effect alone by the doctrine and the preaching of the word of God, and by the administration of the sacraments, to many or to a few persons, according to the call. For by this means are conferred, not temporal, but eternal blessings and treasures; as eternal righteousness, the Holy Spirit, and eternal life. These blessings cannot be obtained otherwise than by the office of the ministry, and by the administration of the holy sacraments."

The *Apology*, also, (XIV., *Of the Power of the Church*) says:

"But we are speaking of true Christian bishops; and we are pleased with the old division, namely: that the power of the bishops consists in *potestate Ordinis* and *potestate Jurisdictionis*, *i. e.* in the administration of the sacraments, and in spiritual jurisdiction."

Now, this "power of the keys," the Saviour, as Head of the Church, has given not, as the Romish doctrine upon this point claims, to the popes nor to the bishops, as a separate and superior order, but to the *Church*, as the whole congregation or body of Christian believers. As is also declared in the *Appendix to the Smalcald Articles:* "To this point the declarations of Christ pertain, which show that the keys are given to the whole Church, and not simply to some particular persons; as the text says, 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' (Matt. 18 : 20). And as Gerhard also, (*De Min. Ecc.*, 87), writes: "Cuicunque claves regni cœlorum ab ipso Christo sunt traditæ, penes eum est jus vocandi ecclesiæ ministros. Atqui toti ecclesiæ traditæ sunt a Christo claves regni cœlorum. Ergo penes totam ecclesiam est jus vocandi ministros."

In what *sense*, however, precisely the Saviour has thus given the keys to the whole Church, whether immediately or mediately, whether He has given them to her as a pure democ-

racy, having in herself, in her collective capacity and directly, the authority to exercise their power, or whether He has done so only mediately, through the ministry which as His ambassadors He has placed in the Church, to act as part of her and for her, and yet in His name as King and Head to be spiritually over her, all this has long been a subject of dispute. Some, as is well known, take the position, and we think correctly, that "the church or congregation has the keys, not *immediately*, but *mediately*, in the word of God and in the holy office of the ministry." Thus Grabau, and many others bearing the Lutheran name, and devoted to the Lutheran polity and doctrine in their most conservative and churchly aspect, earnestly maintain. "If it now be said," writes Grabau, (quoted by Dr. C. A. Hay in Ev. Review, vol. xxi., p. 617) that this special ecclesiastical authority is given by Christ to His *Church* upon earth, nothing more is intended than that it was instituted in the Gospel and set up *in* the Church by ordinary means through the efficacy of the Gospel in the form of the *office of bishop or preacher.*" And again: "In this house of God now there are the keys of Christ through means of the Gospel *and the office of the ministry*, not because they have their origin there, but because that is the appropriate spiritual theatre where they can exhibit their power for the consolation and salvation of souls, and be thus *put to use.* And in *this* sense the Smalcald Articles say that the keys are given to the whole Church."

But, admitting that the power of the keys, whether mediately or immediately, has been given by Christ to the *Church*, three questions may now be pertinently asked, each of which, if correctly answered, will help us into a clearer and better apprehension of our subject, viz.:

When, or in what act, does the Church lawfully exercise this her *jus vocandi*, or right of calling?

Through whom does she lawfully and properly perform this act?

And what is the precise import or character of the act which she thus performs?

First: When, or in what act, does the Church lawfully exercise this her jus vocandi, or right of calling?

Does she do it in the election of a man as its pastor by a single congregation before his ordination, or does she do it in the act of his ordination before his election? Does the election precede the ordination, or does the ordination properly precede the election? Is he elected because he has been ordained, or is he first ordained in order that he may subsequently be properly elected? In a word, does the act of the separate congregation in choosing him to be its pastor, place him in the ministerial office, or does the ordination by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery or Ministerium place him there? Is the voice of the Church, in other words, heard in the voice of the congregation, or in the voice of the Synod or Ministerium representing many congregations and expressing the more general opinion or judgment of the Church in the matter?

It is well known that Luther held to the view that election, and not ordination, constituted the true outward or mediate call of the Church into the office of the ministry. He taught that whenever and wherever a congregation of believers, whether their number be large or small, are associated together in the use of the word and sacraments, and choose or elect one to preach to them that word and administer to them the sacraments, the one thus elected is by that act of election made a minister, or truly and really placed in the ministerial office, and is thus as truly in the office as though he had been ordained by the hands of bishops. The *election* is the "call," and the ordination is merely the subsequent declaration or recognition of the fact that there has been such a "call." (*Vide Luther's Letter to the Senate and People of Prague, in 1523*).

The Appendix to the Smalcald Articles also expresses this view. "The common usages of the Church," it declares, "likewise prove this: for in former times the people elected clergymen and bishops; then the bishops living in or near the same place, came and confirmed those elected by the laying on of hands; and at that time ordination was nothing

else than this approbation." (*Book of Concord, Eng., trans.*, p. 401. Also *Dr. Walther's* "*Kirche und Ampt*," pp. 248–255).

But, however much we all revere the name of Luther, and incline to yield our judgment to his, this view which he thus held that in the congregation itself was divinely vested the *jus vocandi*, and that an election of a man as its pastor by a congregation, constituted a *rite vocatus* and placed such an one legitimately in the office of the ministry, does not at all commend itself to us. It is, we modestly dare to assert, in its entire conception, essentially wrong, and, if practically carried out, would necessarily lead to disastrous results.

It assumes, first of all, that an individual congregation, though it consists of but two or three persons, is the Church. On the contrary, the Church is "the congregation of *all* believers among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel." (*Augs. Con.*, Art. VII.) "The Church," says Schmid, "is the *Kingdom* in which Christ exercises His dominion; and hence many dogmaticians append the doctrine concerning the Church to that concerning Christ as the sovereign in His empire." (*Doctrinal Theology*, p. 602). "The inner and essential form of the Church," says Hollazius, "consists in the spiritual union of true believers and saints who, as members of the Church, are bound together with Christ the Head, through true and living faith, which is followed by a communion of mutual love." The individual congregation, therefore, having the pure word and sacraments, is part of the true Church, and there the Church truly is, but it is not in itself thus alone the Church. A part is never the whole, and should never be regarded as the whole.

Again: this view is based upon extravagant notions of the rights and powers in the case of an individual congregation. Being but part of the whole, it cannot rightfully do anything which affects the whole, without the consent and cooperation of the whole. "The individual congregation," says Prof. Worley, "while it has for itself all the rights and immunities of the Church, is not the Church and has no authority to act for other congregations or for the Church in

general. Congregations sustain to the Church universal about the same relations which individual members do to the congregation. No individual Christian in the exercise of his scriptural rights in the congregation can act for others, or by his own will can determine and act for the congregation; yet he enjoys for himself all the rights and privileges which pertain to the congregation. And so while a congregation may enjoy and claim for itself, and even under particular circumstances perform for itself, all which appertains to the Church at large, no congregation can dictate or legislate or perform any function pertaining to the Church at large, for other congregations or for the whole Church. All those offices of a general nature, which have regard to promoting and securing the welfare and upbuilding of the whole Church, are of this nature, and can only be properly performed by the Church in her representative capacity, an essential and the only steadfast element of which is the holy ministry." (Ev. Review, vol. xv., pp. 317–318).

Again: This theory that the right to call is vested in the individual congregation, and that the election of a man to be pastor of such congregation, is the true call of the Church and puts him into the ministerial office, assumes that the Church, in the true order of events, precedes the ministry, and creates or calls the ministry into existence only as she herself has need of a ministry. But it seems to us clear, beyond room for doubt, that precisely the reverse of all this is true. Instead of the Church preceding the ministry, the ministry precedes the Church, and by the preaching of the word creates and perpetuates the Church. Instead of the office being thus the result of mere human convenience for the orderly and profitable enjoyment of the word and sacraments in and by the Church, it is a separate and divinely established institution, whose field is the world, and whose commission authorizes those filling it to go anywhere as the accredited ambassadors of Christ. And instead of each separate congregation thus exercising the power of the keys and entrusting men with the holy office of the ministry, the Church at large, composed of many congregations, acting in

a representative capacity, alone, except in case of necessity, should do it. To the Church in her official and organic oneness is the power given to call men into the ministry, and this calling does not create the office but merely fills it. Christ Himself is its author, and it is He who, through the Church, acting in her organic capacity in His stead, says to all who rightly enter the sacred office: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world, Amen." (Matt. 28 : 19–20).

But again: The theory under consideration has, we are satisfied, if rightly considered, the weight and authority of the apostles and the early Church, also against it. We know full well that in those early days of Christianity, in many cases no doubt, the election by the congregation preceded in the order of time the act of ordination by the apostles and by others; and under the circumstances no other order could then well have existed. The Church then was in its merely formative state. The great truths and facts of Christianity, as taught by the Saviour during His ministry, and as they occurred and were made known during the Week of Passion and on the day of Pentecost, were carried by the thousands who had come up to Judea and Jerusalem, and afterward by others whom the persecution which arose scattered abroad, into all parts of the world. And, as the result, men and women were won to the truth which they thus heard; converts were rapidly made; churches everywhere sprang quickly into existence; the persons in these churches best qualified were naturally chosen to serve as pastors; and afterward when these churches were visited by the apostles, these men whom the churches had thus chosen as their pastors were the ones, of course, whom at the request of the churches, the apostles ordained. It was altogether the best, and indeed the only order which then could be pursued. But whilst all this is true, does not the very fact that they, under such circumstances, ordained at all, clearly show that the

election by the church was not, in their judgment, a true induction into the office of the ministry, and that the voice of the churches which had thus chosen them was by no means final in the case, but was submitted for final decision to the apostles and to the ministry whom they had ordained, as the highest official representatives of the whole Church? If upon examination, the apostles had discovered that one thus presented to them for ordination was unqualified for the work of the ministry to which he had been chosen by the congregation, they, of course, would have refused to ordain him, and in consequence he would not have been in the ministerial office, even if the Church, defiant of apostolic authority, would still have retained him as their religious teacher or pastor. So that the election, going before ordination, was the result of the peculiar condition in which the Church then, in its incipient or inchoate state, was, and was not designed therefore to be the order of filling the office of the ministry in after times or now. Even then already, no doubt, ordination, in some cases, was administered where there had been no election to become the pastor of some special Church, but where the person or persons ordained were by ordination simply placed in the office and commissioned to go wherever the Providence and Spirit of God might lead them, preaching the word. Thus Paul and Barnabas were set apart, by the laying on of the hands of the other teachers or ministers at Antioch, for the special missionary work upon which they then departed. (Acts 13 : 2–4). There is no proof that Timothy, when, "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," he was ordained, was ordained as the pastor of some special church, but simply that by ordination he was brought into the ministerial office, and thus fitted to receive election as pastor. The same is true, also, of Titus. There is no absolute or certain proof that he was ordained to the exclusive and special work in the island of Crete. Paul merely says: "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." (Tit. 1 : 5). And this command which Paul thus gives him,

as he also gave Timothy, (2 Tim. 2 : 2) to "ordain elders in every city," does not necessarily require that we believe or suppose that these elders or ministers thus ordained had all previously been elected by the people as their pastors. They may have been. There is simply no proof that they were.

And hence, in view of all this, whilst in no case recorded in the New Testament, was a pastor ever placed over a congregation without the full consent and desire of its members, yet this desire and consent, we are satisfied, even if expressed in a formal choice or election, in no instance was regarded as the call into the ministry, but this call was always regarded as being given in ordination. The laying on of the hands of the apostles or presbytery was the act by which the Church, in the name of her ascended Lord and Head, gave the *rite vocatus.*

There are still other objections to this theory of thus making the election the call, and of thus reducing ordination to a mere empty ceremony.

It begs the question with regard to ordination, declaring it to be an unnecessary and useless form merely of approving by the Church at large what the individual congregation has done, which is, indeed, the very point at issue or in dispute.

It is in direct conflict also with the conception of *unity* as an attribute of the true Church of Christ and, by thus giving to each congregation the right to exercise the power of the keys and to admit men to the office of the ministry, it makes the Church no longer "one Holy Catholic Church," but a mere multiple of separate and independent churches.

Again: it places the power of deciding upon the qualifications of candidates for the ministry in the hands of those, in the nature of the case, least able wisely and well to decide upon them; for who will claim that there is in the churches that measure of scriptural intelligence and discriminating knowledge of the ability and fitness demanded in the ministry, which would make it safe or right to submit to popular vote the question of who shall and who shall not constitute

the ministry? (Ev. Review, vol. xi., p. 323). Practically carried out, and literally executed, it is a theory which would, we feel sure, so degrade and lower the standard of ministerial qualification and efficiency, and so involve the Church in peril from within herself, as to render her utterly weak and defenceless against her foes, and imperil her very being.

And so evident is this, that even those who hold to this view that with the congregation rests the right to call, and who strenuously insist upon it as the correct theory concerning the ministerial call, nevertheless do not absolutely and rigidly adhere to it in practice. Among our Missouri Lutheran brethren, *e. g.*, for whom I am sure I cherish the profoundest Christian regard, when a congregation becomes vacant, instead of acting for itself in strict independence, and instead of electing, without consultation or regard for synodical authority, either one of its own number or another from abroad, as its pastor, as a rule, first of all, it applies to the President of the Synod who, in his official position, expresses for the time being the judgment of the Church general in so far as it is represented in the Synod, and whomsoever he names and commends to them as possessing suitable ministerial gifts and as worthy of their confidence and suffrage, the congregation elects; the very thing in substance which is done among us when in Ministerium we ordain a man and and thus commend him to the churches, and when subsequently a church, having confidence in the recommendation thus given, chooses him to be its pastor. In both cases the judgment of the ministry, and not that of the congregation itself, determines the choice.

But, yet another very serious objection to the theory we are combating lies in the view of the ministerial office itself which it necessitates and assumes. As it appears to us it virtually abolishes the office. Accepting the view that the source of the objective or outward call is the individual or local church, instead of the Church catholic as the Body of Christ, and assuming that it does consist in the temporary transfer, for the mere sake of order and propriety in public

worship, of the priestly functions and rights possessed by all the members as part of the universal priesthood, to the one whom they thus choose to be their pastor, there can be no such thing as a separate, divinely-instituted, and divinely-perpetuated ministerial office, and what is called the ministerial office is merely a nice and convenient human arrangement. Under such an order of things there is no office of the ministry at all. Then a man, if a pastor, is a minister, and if not a pastor he is not a minister. Then he is in the ministry to-day, and out of it to-morrow. Then the ministry exists only while performing ministerial acts. Then ordination, if proper and necessary once, is equally proper and necessary, and should be repeated at each change of pastoral field. Then men who have been ordained as pastors, and afterwards became missionaries in heathen lands, or professors in our colleges and seminaries, or editors of our ecclesiastical journals, are no longer in the ministerial office, but sustain to the Church the mere relation of laymen. Surely this is no proper conception of the office. Men whom God has called to the office are not thus called into it or dropped out of it by the mere existence or non existence of actual pastoral relations. On the contrary, the office exists by divine institution in the Church. The call, based upon suitable qualifications, uttered by the Holy Ghost in the conscience of the subject, and recognized and solemnly declared by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery as the organ of the Church in her corporate or official capacity, places the man in the office; and in that office he *abides*, remains a minister and not a layman—whether a pastor or not—until by death, or by the same authority by which he was instrumentally placed in it he is removed from it. And hence the election of a man to be the pastor of a church, instead of thereby making him a minister, or putting him into the ministerial office, is simply, if done rightly, the expression on the part of that church of their belief that he is, by virtue of his ordination, a true minister, and that as such they choose him to be their pastor. His ordination was his call; and now their election of him as pastor is a providential indication to

him of the special field where God wishes him to exercise his ministerial gifts.*

Luther's views are, of course, as we have already said, directly opposed to the position which we have thus taken. And yet in our interpretation of his views, both justice to him and to the truth requires that we should well consider the special character of the conflict which Luther was then waging, and the necessity which was then laid upon him, in the prosecution of his reformatory work, to emphasize sharply, and to defend jealously, individual and congregational Christian rigths over against the hierarchical despotism of Rome, which denied to the people the privilege of choosing spiritual shepherds, and withheld from them the preached word and sacraments in their completeness and purity. In the emergency and necessity thus laid upon him, and as the best possible weapon which he could use against the crushing tyranny which the Papacy was then exercising over the Church,

---

*"The word of God and our Book," says Dr. Hodge, "teach that the right to rule, to preach, to administer the sacraments, and to ordain, belongs to every minister by virtue of his office. If a man is ordained a presbyter, he has, by authority of Scripture, all these rights; and he cannot be deprived of the one any more than of the others. He has indeed no right to exercise his authority either to preach or to rule in a particular congregation without their consent; but their election no more makes him a ruler than it makes him a preacher. * * * To say that a man cannot be a presbyter except in virtue of his connection with a particular Church, is as much as to say a man cannot be a physician without a prescribed number of patients, or a captain if not in actual command of a ship, or a general unless when at the head of a brigade. Owen consistently carries out this doctrine, and maintains that as no man can be a bishop or presbyter but in relation to a particular congregation, no Church has a right to ordain a man to preach to the heathen, (Works, vol. xx., p. 457). When a theory comes to such an issue, it may fairly be assumed to have broken its neck. In the Apostolic Church all ministers ruled. They met together with the apostles and brethren to decide important questions; they formed churches and ordained elders; and yet not one in ten of those ministers was a pastor, or sustained any special or permanent relation to any particular Church. Presbyterians do not believe that Timothy was the pastor of Ephesus, or Titus the bishop of Crete." (*Church Polity*, pp. 267--268).

he revived the long forgotten doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, exhibited and defended it with all the force and vigor of his strong and enthusiastic nature, and made a practical application of it as a remedy for then existing evils, which possibly the exigency of the times demanded, and in doing which he undoubtedly acted with the utmost sincerity, but which, nevertheless, in the normal and established condition of Protestantism, now and since Luther fought and won his great battle, is not needed and cannot safely be practiced. As Dr. Plitt, (*Einleitung in die Augustana*, vol. 2, pp. 374–376) correctly says: "He so strongly emphasized that the official action was identical with the individual action of every Christian in order to oppose the haughty spirit of the Romish officials, who were exalting themselves above all others, declaring their action to be sacramental, and trying to rule over the whole Church." And again: "In order to cut off all possible false inferences and conclusions, we must not forget that Luther was brought to this sharp emphasizing of the rights of the individual congregation, *by the then existing times.* It was a time of great distress in the Church. The official representatives of the Church were not willing to fill the office in the individual congregations with preachers of the pure truth. They abused their right of calling a person into the office to the damage of the Church, while there were in the congregation believing members of the Church, or evangelical Christians. This was the condition of things which demanded peculiar advice and extraordinary measures. And in view of this Luther wrote: 'As a Christian congregation must not and cannot be without the word of God, it is evident that they must also have teachers or preachers proclaiming that word.' (*Walch*, 22, 146). Every individual Christian has the right, and it is his duty, *should necessity urgently demand it*, to act as teacher. How much more, then, is it right that a whole congregation call one to this office, *if need be*, as is at all times, and especially now, the case. It is the duty of the individual congregation to fill the office, regardless of others, *in case of necessity.* Luther always adds this, and in calling for such

(congregational) action, he never forgets to emphasize that the congregation concerned should examine itself whether it stands firm in the faith, and thus have a good conscience with regard to the action which it thus performs. Being assured of this, it can cheerfully act as in the name of God."

The one essential thing, then, in Luther's estimation, was the preaching of the pure word of God and the right administration of the sacraments. This constituted the Church. To this the Church was entitled. And hence, *in case of necessity*, and where those having the power of appointing or ordaining ministers for the Church, abuse their power, and seek to place over the churches pastors who will withhold the pure word and sacraments from them, there, under such circumstances, and as a final and only remedy for such evils, each congregation, upon the strength of the spiritual priesthood to which every baptized member belongs, shall choose or elect for itself a pastor, and such election, even without ordination, shall be and is a true call of the one thus chosen to the office of the ministry. And evidently all that Luther aimed at, in all that he says with regard to the right of a congregation to call into the office of the ministry, was to preserve the churches from having unworthy and false teachers imposed upon them against their consent. They had, he claimed, the essential right to say who should, and who should not, be their pastors. And the question primarily was not so much whether election was the call, as whether there existed the right with the people to elect; and only in order to vindicate this congregational right to elect was he led, upon the ground of the universal priesthood of believers, to take the position that, in case of necessity, such election, even without ordination, was a valid and true call. "We do not say," is the language of the Wittenberg theologians, "that the Romish method of calling pastors is in every particular wrong, in that the bishops ordain ministers; but we cannot approve their course in placing pastors over churches without the knowledge or consent of the people, because, according to the old saying, 'The calling of a pastor, without

the consent of the people, is null and void.'" (*Quoted by Dr. Diehl, Luth. Diet*, 1877, p. 305).

That Luther did not, in thus seeking to defend his position over against the tyrannical claims of Rome, often press too far his doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, and of the office of the ministry as the result merely of the delegated or deputed rights of the many to the few who, for the sake of order in worship, were to conduct the public services and act as pastors, we are not willing to maintain. On the contrary, we believe that he did, and that the office of the ministry, as we have already said, has an infinitely higher origin, is *divine* in its source, and exists as a distinct and divinely perpetuated ordinance in the Church. The doctrine of a spiritual priesthood is undoubtedly a precious truth, and in electing a man as their pastor, the members of a church do, as Luther taught, delegate to him the exercise in public worship of their priestly functions, but in doing so they do not put him into the office of the ministry, but simply into a pastoral care over themselves; for the Church, not as a mere fragment or part, but in her organic and representative whole, has the power of the keys. "The office of teaching and administration is the glory of the Church's organization, and while it takes away from the spiritual priesthood none of its special glory, neither does it borrow its light and authority therefrom. There is a spiritual priesthood; but distinct from it, yea, going before it, is the office of reconciliation, for whose perpetuation the Head of the Church has made special preparation and instituted a certain order." (Ev. Review, vol. xi., p. 339). And even Luther himself, in his later writings, reveals, if not a decided change, at least a great modification of his earlier views upon this whole subject of the relation between the Christian priesthood of believers and the office of the ministry. Instead of regarding the office of the ministry as the product merely of the delegated rights and functions of fellow Christians as equal priests, he evidently conceived it, more and more distinctly, as an ordinance of God, and as an office in the Church and for the Church, but still not essentially of the Church. It is

true, he nowhere in a formal manner retracts his earlier views, and expressly declares that his opinions have changed, but, as has been clearly shown by those who have specially examined his writings in this respect, it is yet simply a fact that Luther, in his later years, assumed substantially a different position in regard to the relation of the universal priesthood to the ministerial office, from the position which he so tenaciously maintained in his earlier years. He more and more came to relinquish his theory of delegation of priestly rights and duties, by the many to the one, as the source and establishment of the office, and conceived it more and more as a distinct and purely *divine* office, founded by Christ, and filled by the Apostles and their successors, in regular and unbroken ministerial succession. (See "*Luther on the Office of the Ministry*," translated from the German of Dr. A. W. Dieckhoff, by Rev. Prof. Martin, Ev. Review, vol. xxi., p. 182).

Thus receding, with his advancing years, from his earlier views with regard to the relation between the universal priesthood of believers and the office of the ministry, Luther, we may now add, must also, logically and necessarily, have receded from the position that the call to the ministry is rightly given through or by the individual congregation, and is limited in the exercise of its functions to the congregation, but must, more and more clearly, have gradually come to see that such a call can lawfully be given only in ordination, by the laying on of the hands of the Ministerium as the official and authoritative organ and expression of the Church universal as the Body of Christ.

The answer then, in view of all that has been said, to the question, "*When, or in what distinct act, does the Church lawfully exercise her jus vocandi, or right of calling?*" at which we arrive is this: The Church thus exercises lawfully her right of calling, or, by virtue of the power of the keys which she possesses, gives the true call to the office of the ministry, not in the act of election by an individual congregation, but in the solemn act of *ordination* by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, or of those who *represent* and *act for* the Church

in her catholic unity and entirety as the corporate and unbroken Body of which Christ is the universal and ever living divine head. Ordination gives the call, and the call which is thus given is the only true outward call into the ministerial office which the Church either does or can give. Election, on the other hand, when rightly and properly effected, is simply the choice, on the part of a congregation, of one who by ordination is already in the office, as its pastor, in order that he may in that relation exercise the functions of the office with which he had by ordination been entrusted. Ordination, therefore, except in cases of extremity or necessity, in the order of time, comes first, and election comes after. Ordination gives the office; election gives the opportunity for the proper and lawful exercise of the office. Ordination makes a man a minister of the gospel; election recognizes him as such, and invites him to his official work because he is a minister.

Having thus answered our *first* question, "When or in what special act, does the Church lawfully exercise her right of calling?" we proceed to the discussion of our second, viz:

Through whom does the Church lawfully and properly perform this act, or give this call to the ministerial office?

Assuming, as we have tried to prove, that *ordination* is the special act in which induction into the ministerial office occurs, or in which the Church gives the call, the question now arises by *whom* is this ordination to be administered? Through whom, as participants in the act, does the Church thus give the call? Is this ordinance of inducting into the office administered wholly by those in the office, or are others also to join with the ministry in its administration? In a word, by whom does the Church, in the act of ordination, express her judgment, and give the call to the office of the ministry?

I use the word "*ordination*," in this connection, in its widest sense, including the examination of the candidate, the decision with regard to his qualification or fitness for the office, and then the solemn ceremony or act itself consisting in the "laying on of hands" according to apostolic practice.

As is well known, there are, even among those who hold that the call should be given, not by an individual Church, but by the Church general in her representative or corporate capacity, different opinions as to the persons by whom properly this act of thus ordaining or inducting into the ministerial office should be performed. The one theory or opinion regards the ministry, or those in the ministerial office, the "*Ordo*" itself, as the only proper agent for its legitimate and right performance. The other theory or opinion regards the ministry *and* the laity, in joint synodical relation, as the proper agent or instrument by which the induction into the sacred office should be made. The one theory expresses itself in the "Formula of Government," framed by our fathers, in the words which declare: "The *Clergy* shall then hold a meeting consisting exclusively of Scripture elders, that is preachers, for the purpose of attending to those duties which Christ and his apostles enjoined upon them *alone*, viz., examination, licensure and ordination of candidates for the ministry. This meeting is called the ministerium or presbytery, by which in Scripture is meant ministers alone." (*Formula*, ch., xvii., sec, 1). The other theory expresses itself in words like the following: "It is both the right and the duty of the whole Church, through her representatives, clerical and lay, to take an active part in the discussions and decisions of all questions affecting her welfare, and among others, especially also in the great question as to who shall constitute her ministry." (Ev. Review, vol. xii., p. 405). And, for the practical adoption of this latter theory, whether wisely or not time will reveal, provision has been made by our General Synod in her revised constitution for District Synods, where it is declared: "In all cases where District Synods *have not made provision for a Ministerium*, all the powers and duties prescribed in this Article (on *Ministerium*) shall devolve on the Synod." (Article viii., sec. 14).

To this second theory there are, in my judgment clear and weighty objections, and the first theory therefore, which maintains that ordination is properly the act alone of the ordained, or that those only who are themselves rightly in the office can rightly induct others into it, is the theory which I

believe accords best both with the intrinsic fitness of things or essential requirements of the case, and the indications or teachings upon the subject of the word of God. The advocates of the former of these two theories, namely that the laity should also have a voice in determining who shall constitute the ministry, do not, it should in justice to them be said, ask that the immediate act of ordination itself, the laying on of hands, or the public ceremony by which the candidate is set apart to the work of the ministry, should be participated in by the laity. This they admit should be done by the ministry only. All that they demand is that the laity should sit with the clergy in the examination into the qualification or fitness for the office of the candidate, and should have a vote or voice in determining who shall be ordained. "I have not only," says one distinguished advocate of the supposed rights of the laity in the matter, "no objection to ministers ordaining ministers, but believe that it is very proper and becoming that they should do this." And another equally respected champion for lay-rights in determining who shall fill the ministerial office, uses this language: "Nor does this proposition contemplate any interference on the part of the laity with any of the prerogatives that can be clearly shown to belong to the ministry, as for instance, their right and duty to *ordain*, *i. e.* solemnly set apart to their official work, by prayer and the imposition of hands, those whom God has called, through the Church, to that department of Christian activity. Ordination is evidently set forth in the Scriptures as a presbyterial, *i. e.* ministerial act, and should therefore be performed by ministers alone. And all the opposition manifested to the proposed change, on the ground that the laity have no right to ordain, arose from an entire misapprehension of the question at issue. No claim of that kind is set up on behalf of the laity. We have no sympathy whatever with those who claim for the so-called *lay-elders* a right to participate in this solemnity." (Ev. Review, vol. xii., p. 403). And a more recent defender of the laity over against the ministry, upon this question of ordination, narrows the point of dispute if possible still more. "The actual point of differ-

ence," he says, "is neither who shall examine candidates for licensure, nor who shall ordain, that is perform the ceremony of induction into the sacred office. About the superior competency and the propriety of the *ministry* to conduct the examination of candidates, or about the special fitness and more orderly mode of the ministry performing the act of ordination, there is no variance of opinion. It must be borne in mind distinctly that the present is not a case of either competency, fitness, or order, but a case of inherent authority or power. The real question, then, about which there can be any dispute among those who adhere to the Lutheran view of Church polity is, to whom has been delegated primarily the authority to license and ordain." (QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. vi., p. 250).

The point at issue then, in answer to the special question now before us, namely, "Through whom does the Church lawfully and properly perform the act of ordination or give the call to the ministerial office?" is, whether the laity are entitled to take any part whatever in determining to whom the call to the office of the ministry shall be given. Does the Church in giving the call express or decide such call alone through *the ministry* as her representatives and acting in her stead, or does she do so through the joint action, as her representatives, both of ministry *and* laity?

That the true call to the office of the ministry is given only and solely through the ministry, as the divinely appointed representatives of the Church, and that the laity are entitled to no participation whatever in determining to whom it shall be given, is evident to my own mind, if not to that of others, for a number of reasons.

(1). One reason lies in the fact that the opposite view rests, in its very foundation, upon certain mere assumptions or mere half truths at best.

One of these mere assumptions or half truths is the false or one-sided view of the Church as a Republic, an ecclesiastical Democracy, in which the popular will and popular suffrage are the source of authority and power. There is, of course, some truth in this view; but, by no means, the whole truth, nor the chief and essential truth. The Church of Christ, in its essen-

tial elements, is, not a Republic, but a Kingdom. (Psalm 2 : 6 ; Dan. 7 : 14 ; Eph. 1 : 22–23). But if the Church is thus a *Kingdom* then the source of power and authority is not in the ruled but in the ruler, not in popular suffrage, but in the order of things as established in the very organization of the Church by the Divine King of this Kingdom ; for in a Kingdom the authority does not flow from below upward, but from above downward. And this is precisely, as we think, where exists the source of authority with regard to the office and perpetuation of the ministry. If the Church is a pure Republic, a mere Democracy, then, without a single word of debate, we will freely admit that the laity shall share in giving the call to the ministry ; and will also admit that they *alone* shall give it ; for then, as a divine institution, there is no office of the ministry at all in the Church. But if, on the other hand, the Church is a Kingdom, and Christ is the Head and King, then is there also a government over the Church ; and if there be a government then also must there, by divine appointment, be officers to whom is entrusted the exercise of the authority and functions of that government. These officers, at first appointed or commissioned by the King Himself, were the Apostles. Since the Apostles, and virtually as their successors, the officers in this Kingdom of Christ are the gospel ministry.* For whilst in the gift of

---

* "Our Lord before His ascension instituted the office of the *Apostolate,* having within it all the powers of the future ministry. The Apostolate had *extraordinary* and incommunicable powers and functions. It had also *ordinary* and communicable powers and functions, which were to be transmitted and perpetuated in and through the ordinary ministry to the end of the world." (Mark 3 : 13, 14 ; Matt. 10 : 2 ; Luke 6 : 13 ; Acts 1 : 2–25 ; Rom. 1 : 5 ; 1 Cor. 12 : 28, 29 ; Eph. 2 : 20 ; 2 Pet. 3 : 2 ; Rev. 21 : 14 ; 1 Tim. 2 : 7 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 11 ; 2 Peter 1 : 1 ; 1 Tim. 1 : 18 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 13 ; 2 Tim. 2 : 2 ; Matt. 28 : 20 ; 2 Cor. 5 : 19). * * *

"In addition to their extraordinary or special powers and functions, the Apostles had the *ordinary* ones, common to the whole ministry, to wit : the preaching of the Gospel, conferring the sacraments, administering discipline, and ordaining others to the ministry. In each and all of these they were but fellow-presbyters, ministers, pastors and bishops with other ministers." (Acts 1 : 20 ; 5 : 42 ; 20 : 24 ; Rom.

inspiration, and in the power of working miracles, and in the ability of discerning spirits, and in some other respects, the Apostles stand alone and have no successors, yet as the commissioned and authorized expounders of the King's message, as the administrators of His sacraments, and as the possessors of the right to exercise the power of the keys, they have successors, and those successors are not a line of popes or bishops as a superior and distinct order, but the Christian Ministry, filling an office whose chief work is the preaching of the divine word. But this office, in the very nature of the case, or in view of the very fact that the Church is not a republic but a kingdom, cannot be filled by the voice and suffrage of the people, but can only be filled, either immediately by the King Himself, or mediately by those whom the King has authorized so to do in His stead. Those thus authorized are, we feel convinced, not the Church, as a mere popular assembly, but the ministry as part of the Church, acting in the name of Christ and with the authority of Christ, for the Church.

Another assumption or half-truth upon which the right is claimed for the laity to share in filling the ministerial office, is that which regards the universal priesthood of believers as the source of the ministerial office. We have already expressed ourselves freely upon this point. But this we wish yet here most emphatically to express, namely that the office

---

1 : 15; Eph. 3 : 8; 6 : 19; 1 Cor. 4 : 1; Matt. 28 : 19; 1 Peter 5 : 1; 1 Cor. 3 : 5; 2 Cor. 11 : 23; Col. 1 : 7, 23–25; John 21 : 16).

"In their extraordinary powers and functions, the Apostles had no *successors*. In their ordinary ones all true ministers of Christ are their successors. There is a ministerial succession unbroken in the Church; but there is no personal succession in a particular line of transmission. The ministry that is, ordains the ministry that comes. The ministry of successive generations has always been inducted into the office of the ministry preceding; but the so-called apostolical succession or canonical succession does not exist, would be incapable of demonstration if it did exist, and would be of no essential value even if it could be demonstrated." (1 Tim. 1 : 18; 4 : 14; 5 : 22; Acts 14 : 23; 2 Tim. 2 : 2; Titus 1 : 5).—*Thetical Statement of the Doctrine concerning the Ministry of the Gospel, by Dr. C. P. Krauth.*

of the ministry is purely and only an office of *divine* institution. Or, in the words of another: "The Christian Ministry is of direct divine appointment, and whilst the call may be mediated through the Church, it is no growth or development out of any universal priesthood. The doctrine of development or evolution, as applied to the ministry, has no more foundation in the word of God than it has in the world of nature. In both cases it tends to exclude a designing and governing Mind: in the one we must dispense with an all-wise Creator, in the other with Him who is Head over all to His Church. In the Smalcald Articles we read, not that the office of the ministry springs out of the universal priesthood of believers, but:

"We are clearly taught that the office of the ministry originates from the common call of the Apostles."

Again:

"It must be confessed, that the Church is not built upon the power of any man, but it is built upon that office which bears the confession made by Peter, namely that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God, (Matt. 16 : 16); for this reason Christ also speaks unto him as a minister of that office, in which this confession and doctrine should exist; and he says: Upon this rock, that is upon this doctrine and ministerial office."

The German has, *diese Predigt und Predigampt:* the Latin, *hoc ministerium.* If the Church, according to this testimony of the Reformers, is built upon the ministry—of course Christ Himself being the chief corner stone—how can the ministry be developed as an office out of the Church? Individual ministers may spring from the bosom of the Church, and may be recognized and authorized by the Church to exercise their office in the midst of the Church, but the office itself is of divine appointment, and underlies the very existence of the Church." (Quarterly Review, vol. vi., p. 409).

Still another of these half-truths which becloud and mislead the minds of many, and which serve to produce the view that to the laity as well as to the ministry belongs the right to give the ministerial call, is the plausible sophism that the ministry

is the servant of the Church, and that the Church, in the very nature of things, should be allowed the privilege of determining who shall be its servants in the ministry. To which we answer: The ministry is, in a certain sense, the servant of the Church. It is one of the ascended Saviour's gifts to the Church, for the edifying of the Church. "For all things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas." (1 Cor. 3 : 22). But, in the highest and in the supreme sense, the minister of the Gospel is not the servant of the Church at all, but purely and only the servant of Christ. "We are ambassadors for *Christ*"—"Paul, a servant of *Jesus Christ*"—"If I yet pleased men I should not be the servant of *Christ*"—"The gospel which was preached of me, is not after man, for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of *Jesus Christ*"—"Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves and to all the flock over the which *the Holy Ghost* hath made you overseers;" texts which teach that the minister is not primarily the servant of the Church, but the servant of Christ. Besides, this sophism that the ministry are the servants of the *Church*, assumes that the laity alone constitute the Church; whereas the ministry and the laity together, as fellow-believers in Christ, constitute it, and hence the action of the ministry, in filling the ministerial office, although not formally authorized by the laity to do so, is nevertheless the act of the Church, done not by the whole body but by part of it, namely by the ministry, whom Christ as Head of the Church has, as we believe, authorized to act in this respect for the whole Church, as her representative and proper organ of official conduct.

(2). But we derive a *second* argument against granting to the laity a voice in determining to whom the call to the ministry shall be given, *on the ground of their evident incapacity rightly to discriminate and judge concerning ministerial qualifications.* We are well aware that to assume such a position exposes one to popular censure and even odium. But, whilst aware of all this, we still prefer to be honest and frank in the utterance of our opinion. For the piety and exalted character of the laity of our Church, and of all Protestant Churches,

we have a most profound respect, and cherish for them as brethren in Christ a most fervent Christian affection. For the intelligence, and sound practical sense, and power of wise judgment which *many* of them, scattered here and there through our Churches, possess, we also cherish a very high opinion. But still, taking the laity of any Church as a body, accepting the average degree of intelligence and discrimination which they possess, we have no hesitation to declare that they are utterly incompetent rightly to judge and decide concerning the qualifications requisite on the part of a candidate for the ministerial office. Of course this is a point which cannot well be determined by argument. But does it, we may ask, seem reasonable to expect that the lay element of our Churches would be competent judges in the case? Are not the qualifications required for admission into the ministerial office such, as in the very order of things, or in the very nature of the case, would lie outside of the study and knowledge of almost every one except those who are themselves in the office of the ministry? What reason have we to expect that laymen as a body have the ability to sit as wise and discriminating judges of a candidate's knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, of the Evidences of Christianity, of Natural and Revealed Theology, of Church History, of Pastoral Theology, of the Rules of Sermonizing, and of Church Government? And even in regard to the simple and practical subject of the candidate's personal piety, or moral and spiritual fitness for the ministerial office, how many of our laymen, in the present day, are imbued with utterly unscriptural and erroneous conceptions of conversion and of the new life of Christ in the soul, unfitting them to judge correctly, even in this respect, of a man's fitness for the work. Why, in every other profession and department of trade or business, are those, and those only, who are themselves in the profession or trade or business, set to judge, and regarded as alone competent to judge, with regard to the fitness of those applying for admission, whilst for admission into this highest of all professions, requiring the most special

qualifications, and involving the highest and most lasting responsibilities, the decision of the case is to be, in large part, submitted to those who are themselves outside of the profession, and who make no pretension to a knowledge of many or any of its requirements. Why should lawyers alone decide who shall be admitted to the practice of law, and physicians alone who shall enter the medical profession, and military men alone who shall be enrolled in the ranks of the military, and mechanics alone who shall be received into the different unions or orders of mechanics, those *in* each profession and no others, weighing the qualifications and deciding as to the fitness of those who apply for admission, and yet the ministry be denied the right and privilege of determining who shall be admitted into the office of the ministry? Why should this be pressed as an exception? Why, in this case, and in this case alone, should those not in the profession be made judges of men's fitness for the profession? The demand, upon the very face of it, bears the evidence of its own unreason and impropriety, and merits prompt and most emphatic refusal.

If the lay element sent up to our synodical assemblies by the churches were always the wisest and most discerning men in the churches, selected and sent because of their superior wisdom and power of discernment, our opposition, on this ground of incompetency, to allowing the laity a voice in determining to whom the ministerial call should be given, would, we admit, be largely modified, although even then, upon other grounds, we would still oppose it. But to those of us who know that the direct reverse is the case, that men are thus sent without regard whatever to intelligence or ability for their mission, but often simply to please and humor them, or because they often are the only ones whom the pastor can secure to accompany him, and to those of us who have noted the appalling stupidity and mental vacancy of many of the laymen who make up our synodical roll, we feel that it would be a most fearful violation of every thing sacred and right, degrading the ministerial office and imperiling the interests of the Gospel and cause of Christ, to accord

to any such element even the faintest voice in determining to whom shall be given the call to the high and holy office of the ministry. And hence, not by ministers *and* layman, and not by *Synods*, composed of the latter as well as the former, but by ministers *only*, assembled purely as a Ministerium, should the Church give the call to the ministerial office!

(3). A *third* argument, however, against granting to the lay element of the Church any part whatever in determining to whom the ministerial call should be given, may be derived from the fact that this is the judgment and practice of the Protestant Church generally. In itself this, of course, would not constitute a valid argument; for there is a possibility, although by no means a probability, that in this respect the general judgment and practice might be unscriptural and erroneous. But it still has some force as an argument and helps to confirm what other arguments serve to establish. Instead, therefore, of abolishing the Ministerium, as the organ by which to examine and ordain men into the office of the ministry, and entrust such examination and ordination to a Synod composed of laymen as well as of ministers, as has been claimed, on the ground that such a step would place us as a Church "in an attitude of desirable conformity to the faith and usages of our Protestant brethren," we find that by doing so we would really be sundering ourselves from them, and would be departing from the judgment and practice of the Church general in this respect. Neither in the Methodist Episcopal, in the Presbyterian, in the Congregational, nor in the Protestant Episcopal Church, do laymen, as laymen, have either voice or vote in determining who shall be admitted into the ministerial office. In all these large and intelligent denominations, the ministry alone rightly determine to whom the ministerial call shall be given. For, as Dr. Hodge correctly says, "It is a principle which is universally admitted by all denominations of Christians, except the Independents, that the right to ordain to any office in the Church belongs to those who hold that office, or one superior to it, and which includes it." And again: "If then it is admitted that ministers and ruling elders hold different offices,

and if, as has been clearly shown from the constitution, ordination confers office, the inference seems unavoidable that those only who hold the office of a minister of the Gospel can confer that office upon others. Presbyterians deny the right of ordination to the civil magistrate; they deny it, under ordinary circumstances, to the people; they deny it to any who have not themselves been invested with the office conferred." Again: "Presbyterial ordination is ordination by a presbyter or presbyters, and not by a presbytery, in our technical sense of the term. This is surely the doctrine of the Scriptures, and the only doctrine on which we can hold up our heads in the presence of prelacy," (*Church Polity*, pp. 273, 275, 293).

The position, then, which we take, in thus excluding the laity from any direct part in the admission of men into the office of the ministry, is not a singular one, but is the position which, for good reasons, has been adopted by a number of the largest and most intelligent denominations which, today, compose Protestant Christendom. The judgment of them all is that it is both right in principle and expedient in practice that those only who are themselves in the ministry should exercise the right of calling others into the ministry.

(4). A *fourth* argument, however, in favor of our position, that ministers only should give the call to the ministerial office we derive from the fact that this, we believe, notwithstanding all that has been cited and written to the contrary, is the position which our Lutheran Confessions and the writings of our greatest Lutheran dogmaticians, honestly and impartially interpreted, really maintain.

As is well known, there are, according to our leading Lutheran writers, in the Church, three estates or orders, namely the ecclesiastical, the political, and the domestic, or the Presbytery, the Magistracy, and the Laity, to each of which three estates or orders, as part of the Church, belongs some share in the provision and settlement of pastors.

Without entering into any discussion of the correctness of this division of the Church into these three estates, and of this conclusion that to each thus belongs the right to share

in providing the Church with a ministry, yet one thing is manifest, namely that our Lutheran confessors and dogmaticians had clear conceptions of what was, in the calling of men into the ministry, the proper and special part, according to their judgment, of each of these three estates; and that, according to their judgment, the duty of examining candidates for the ministry, deciding upon their qualifications, and then by ordination inducting them into the sacred office, was purely and only the work of the first of these three estates, (*Status Ecclesiasticus*) or the ministry.

This Article (XIV.) of the Augsburg Confession, whilst very strongly declaring that no one shall perform the duties of the ministerial office without a right call to the office, does not, it is true, declare *by whom this call shall be given.* The *vocatio*, it declares, is necessary. No one can make himself a member of the estate or ministerial order. It must be done, in the name of the Church, by others. But it does not definitely state by whom. And yet Melanchthon, in his explanation afterward of the Article in the *Apology*, indicates, we think, clearly by whom, in his judgment, this call to the ministry by ordination should be given, and by whom only it should be given. According to that explanation he was willing, if only it was recognized as merely *auctoritate humana*, to abide by the order then prevailing, *i. e.* to accord to the Romish bishops exclusively the right of ordaining to the ministry, thus even depriving the ministry, as a class, of the right, and much more, of course, depriving the laity of the right. The addition, also, which he afterward makes in the *Variata*, in the words "sicut et Paulus praecipit Tito, ut in civitatibus Presbyteros constituat," confirms the view that the "*rite vocatus*" demanded by the Fourteenth Article of the Confession, could, according to Melanchthon's opinion, be given only by the ministry or by those themselves in the order, as was Titus to whom Paul thus gave command to ordain others into it. It should, also, as Bilmar (*Die Augsburgische Confession erklärt von A. F. C. Bilmar*, p. 131) well says, "be noted that the Confession, in harmony with the passages from the preface relating thereto,

assumes the words "*Kirchen-regiment*," or "*Church Government*," and "*Ordo*" to be synonymous, thereby unequivocally excluding from church government him who has not the "Ordo," *i. e.* lay-men. Spiritual things such as the preaching of the word, the administration of the sacraments, and the power of the keys, appertain to the *Ordo* only, and to no one else, no one except the Ordo having anything to say in regard to them."

Article XXVIII. of the Confession will help us to determine what were Melanchthon's precise views upon the point now under consideration. He there expresses himself distinctly. "The bishop's (*i. e.* ministers) office, according to divine right, is therefore to preach the Gospel, to remit sins, to judge of doctrine, etc." But, if it is thus in general the especial duty of the ministry "to judge of doctrine," it surely also is " to judge of the doctrine" as held by those seeking a call from the Church to preach.

As far, therefore, as we can gather from the Confession itself, or from the Apology, the confessors designed by the Fourteenth Article of the Augustana to teach that the call to the office of the ministry should only be given by the ministry. And, if the question be asked, why did they not clearly state that this was their sense of it, we reply: There was no *necessity* to do so. "This particular point was not in dispute. At that time no one questioned the right and propriety of candidates for the ministry being examined by those already in the holy office." (Quarterly Review, vol. vi., p. 85).

Upon this subject of the call to the ministry Luther has written much, and not always, we are compelled to add, with as much clearness and self consistency as could be desired. As may be seen in quotations from his writings, presented in preceding parts of our lecture, and in many others which might be given, especially the well known language of the Smalcald Articles bearing upon this point, he has clearly expressed the opinion that "*churches*, *i. e.* local congregations, possess the authority to call, elect, and ordain ministers"—that "wherever there is a true *Church* there is also the power to elect and ordain ministers"—that "the true Church be-

cause it alone possesses a priesthood, must also have power to choose and ordain ministers." And yet in the interpretation of this language of Luther, in order to ascertain precisely what his views were, we must do two things. We must, first, grasp clearly the point under dispute in connection with which he uses such language. We must ask: What is the scope or aim of it? To any one who will do this it will become manifest that Luther, in the use of such language, always employs it, not to assert that the *people*, and *not* the ordained ministry, or that the people together *with* the ordained ministry, should examine, vote upon, and ordain men into the office of the ministry, for that is never the point disputed, but to assert, over against the hierarchical claims of Rome, that the people and not the bishops shall have the right to determine who shall be their ministers or pastors. "The Reformers were protesting against the right of the popes and bishops to deprive the churches of proper teachers or ministers, and arrogate to themselves the exclusive authority to make and appoint priests at their pleasure, without the consent of churches and regardless of their welfare." And then we must, secondly remember that when Luther thus asserts the right of Churches to give the call to the office of the ministry, he guards or cautions carefully against the *exercise* of this inherent right except *in case of necessity;* and he "reminds those who would pervert his teachings that he has said such things only *of extreme necessity.*" Bearing these two things steadily in mind, even Luther's strong assertions, seemingly favoring the opposite view, can all, we believe, be harmonized with the position that the ordained ministry alone should admit men into the ministry.

What the testimony of the leading dogmaticians of our Church is upon this point is familiar to us all. Availing myself of the labors of others, I cite the following extracts in proof of the position for which I am contending:

Chemnitz, L. T. (*De Ecclesia*, iii., p. 123): "It is certainly and clearly evident both from the commands and examples of Scripture (Tit. 1 : 5; 1 Tim. 4 : 14; 2 Tim. 2 : 2; Acts 14 : 22) that *those who are already in the ministry, and profess*

the sacred doctrine, should be employed whenever through a mediate call the ministry is entrusted to any one. * * Therefore the election and call of ministers of the Church should not be submitted either to the ministers alone, or to the magistrates alone, or to the ignorance and inconsiderateness of the promiscuous multitude alone."

GERHARD, L. T. (*De Min. Eccl.* § 85): "That bishops and presbyters are to be employed when the ministry is to be entrusted to any one, is evident both from the apostolic command and approved examples of scripture. The same is confirmed by clear reason. For those who have been previously engaged in the ministry, and who profess the sound doctrine, can judge most correctly concerning the qualifications of those who are to be called to the office of teaching."

Ib. (86): "Speaking generally, and to give an example, we may say that the examination, ordination, and inauguration belong to the *Presbytery*; the nomination, presentation and confirmation to the *Christian Magistrate*; and the consent, vote and approval, or, according to circumstances, the demand, to *the People.* Therefore the general principle that pastors should be called with the consent of the Church, or that no one should be obtruded upon the Church when it is unwilling, has express testimonies in scripture, and was approved by the constant practice of the primitive Church; but the form of the election *in specie* varies, for sometimes the vote of the people was necessary in nominating persons, and sometimes their approval was required for those before nominated." (Acts 1 : 15, 23, 26; 6 : 3; 14 : 23; 1 Cor. 16 : 3; 2 Cor. 8 : 19; 1 Tim. 3 : 7; 5 : 22; 4 : 14).

QUENSTEDT, T. D. P. (*De Min. Eccl.*, iii., 402): "Each part of the Church has its own functions in the calling of ministers. It is the office of the clergy to examine the candidates for the ministry, to inquire into their learning and life, to consider and judge concerning the gifts necessary for the ministry of the Church, and to inaugurate them by the laying on of hands. It belongs to the Christian magistrate to nominate them, to present them when called, and to ratify their examination. The duty of the people is to give the call, to approve by their vote and testimony, and to elect."

Hollazius, (*Examen De Min. Ecc.*, q. vii. Prob. b.): "The call of ministers generally and comprehensively considered (as embracing election, ordination, and the call specially so called) should be so attended to by the whole Church, and all its three orders, that due order be preserved and confusion be avoided. Therefore the examination, ordination and inauguration belong to the *presbytery*, the nomination, presentation and confirmation to the Christian magistrate, and the consent, vote and approval to the people."

Hunnius, (782): "To ministers belongs the right of ordaining ministers."

Now, we have made these quotations from the writings of our leading dogmaticians for a single purpose, viz., to show that whatever part, in the giving of the ministerial call, they may assign to the magistracy or to the people, the part of examining, ordaining and inducting into the office they unanimously accord alone to the ministry. If necessary many other extracts might be added to these which we have thus given, making this point clear beyond all possibility of denial. The existence, therefore, of a *Ministerium*, by whom alone the induction of men into the ministerial office shall be performed, is, we believe, thoroughly Lutheran or in entire harmony with the views of the leading Lutheran dogmatic writers. And with such an arrangement, even under our American republican form of government, each of the three estates or orders, according to these old dogmaticians, literally exercises its proper right or part in the giving of the call. The magistracy, instead of directly exercising its right, delegates the exercise of it to the other two estates or orders. The ministry examine and ordain or call into the office. And the people elect or choose their own pastors, thus confirming the judgment and act of the ministry. And thus, in this related and joint act of the state the ministry and the people, the Church, which embraces them all, gives the ministerial call.

(5.) A final argument, however, and the most weighty of all, in favor of our position, that to the ministry alone belongs the right to give the call to the ministry, we base upon

the fact that this, we believe, is *the position, or teaching, of the word of God.*

Of course, the very question in dispute is: What does the word of God teach concerning the matter? What is, according to the Scriptures, the right method of perpetuating the ministry? What was the precise order of procedure in the induction of men into the ministerial office employed by the apostles and the primitive Church? According to the principles and practices found in the Bible, is the investment of men with ministerial authority the act properly alone of the ministry, or is it the joint act both of the people and ministry? Or, drawing the lines still closer, even where it is evident that the act of inducting into the sacred office was performed by the ministry alone, was it thus performed by power and authority vested in them, as the incumbents of the office, by Christ the Head of the Church, or was it performed by power and authority delegated to them by the Church, as the act of the Church whose official representatives they, for the time being, were?

To these questions, by men equally eminent for ability and piety, directly opposite conclusions have been reached and opposite answers have been given. To some, viewing the question in the light of God's word, it is clear that *the ministry alone*, by divine authority, and to the entire exclusion of the laity, possess the authority to make ministers or to give the call to the ministerial office; and to others, viewing the subject in the same light, it is equally clear that the true call to the ministry is the act of the Church, *embracing both the ministry and the laity*, and hence that even when the act is wholly performed by the ministry, it is yet thus performed, not as the separate and independent act of the ministry, as having in itself divine authority so to do, but as the act of the Church, having in itself by divine bestowal the authority to call, but delegating to the ministry, because of its greater competency, the exercise of this authority.

The Scriptures therefore do not, we may assume, with entire clearness, and beyond room for controversy, determine by whom precisely this call to the ministry is to be given.

Our judgment, however, is that the weight of Bible testimony is very decidedly in favor of the position that the ministry is a purely self-perpetuating institution in the Church; being itself part of the Church and officially representing the Church, and yet deriving its authority not from the Church but from Christ the divine Head of the Church. The right, therefore, to give the call to the ministry is one which, we believe, belongs wholly and only to the ministry, and this not as a delegated right from the Church but as a divinely conferred right from Christ. We are willing to adopt as our own the views expressed by Löehe, (*Aphorismen über die Neutestamentlichen Aempter*, p. 71): "The office stands in the midst of the Church like a fruitful tree that has its seed in itself. As long as the examination and ordination remain in the hands of the presbyterium or pastors it is right, and can be maintained that it completes itself, and propagates itself from person to person and from generation to generation. Those who hold it pass it along, and he to whom its incumbents transfer it, holds it as from God. The office is a stream of blessing that pours itself from the Apostles upon their disciples, and from these onward into future times." Or we accept the declartion of Grabau (*Der Missourische u. Iowanische Geist und die Lehre der Lutherischen Kirche*, p. 20): "As Christ is the only Lord and ruler of His Church, and as such has given the holy ministry, the Gospel and the sacraments, and has thereby established for Himself an office of the ministry, so church government (Kirchen-regiment) does not rest upon the relinquishment of rights or upon regulations made by the multitude, but primarily upon the faithful service of the pastors and the ministers of God's word, from which goes forth the faith and the life of the congregation."

This position that the ministry is thus a self-perpetuating office, and is such by divine appointment and arrangement, and not by any delegated authority from the Church to the ministry to act in its name and as its organ, is, we believe, thoroughly in accord with the teachings of the word of God.

Our Blessed Saviour, shortly before His ascension into Heaven, instituted, in a formal and authoritative manner, the

apostolic office. In the commission which He then gave the eleven He said: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," or end of the "age," *i. e.* of this present dispensation or Christian age: ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. Looking at this commission we find that its duties consisted of the following three particulars: μαθητεύειν, βαπτίζειν, and διδάσκειν, *i. e.* 1. To disciple all nations, or convert them to the faith; 2. To initiate them into the Church by baptism; and 3. To instruct them, when baptized, in the doctrines and duties of a Christian life. (*Bloomfield in loc*).

But this, as we all know, is substantially the work also of the ministry. Essentially, therefore, the apostolic office and the ministerial office are the same office. The apostles, in certain well defined gifts and duties, necessary and devolving upon them in their especial work of founding or planting the Church, of course stand alone and have, as we have already said, no successors. But in so far as the special duties are concerned which their commission, which was their call to the office, details, and which the Saviour laid upon them as their official life-work, they have legitimate and true successors in the gospel ministry. The functions to be performed both by the apostles and by the ministry are in substance, or in their essential character, the same, and hence the office in both is essentially also the same. (Ev. Rev., vol. xi., p. 320).

A further examination, however, of this apostolic commission reveals the additional fact that it was not addressed by the Saviour to the apostles simply as individuals, to be limited to them, and to terminate with them, but it was addressed to them, *as the incumbents of an office*, which was to continue after them, and which was to take up and carry on the work which they thus, under the Saviour's command and direction, began. The very terms of the commission disclose that this is its character. "He commands, in the first place, to go into all the world; for the purpose, in the second place,

of preaching the Gospel to every creature; assured, in the third place, that He is with them always, and even unto the end of the world. Either of these propositions, or all of them together, most positively precludes the idea that this language of the Saviour was addressed to the apostles in their merely *individual* capacity; for neither did they, nor could they themselves go into all the world, preach the gospel to every creature, and unto *the end of the world* be assured that Christ was with them in authority and power." (Ev. Review, vol. xi., p. 327).

And yet this commission thus to disciple all nations by baptizing and by teaching, or by the performance of ministerial functions, is specifically addressed by the Saviour to *them*, the Eleven, and not to the general body of believers, or to the people with them as constituting together the Church.

The conclusion, therefore, it appears to us, is inevitable that the words of the commission were not only an investiture of the apostles with divine authority themselves to enter the ministerial office, but also to call others into it; *i. e.* to perpetuate the office, so that after them those whom they had chosen and ordained as their successors might carry on the work which they had thus begun. They themselves, by the very terms of the commission, were, without the co-operation of the general body of believers, authorized by the Saviour both to be ministers and to call or make ministers. As Prof. Worley, expresses it: "The only logical deduction that can be made from the passage (Math. 28 : 16–20) is that it was addressed to the Eleven as those from whom, until the end of time, yet under Christ, in themselves and in those to whom they committed the authority by the will of Christ, the office of preaching should go forth, bearing in its hands the gracious blessing of salvation to the whole perishing world, and until the Church militant is completely taken up into the Church triumphant." (Ev. Review, vol. xi., p. 328).

And this deduction, as the same writer further shows, is confirmed by the entire subsequent practice or acts of the Apostles. Instead of referring the appointment of ministers, either wholly or in part, to the people, or to the whole con-

gregation of believers, they, there is clear proof, at least in many, if not in all instances, assumed the authority thus to appoint all to themselves, thus showing that they had in their commission been invested by the Saviour with such authority, "that Christ *intended* it so to be, viz.: that the authorization of public teachers in the Church should proceed from those whom He had appointed already to the office."

In evidence of this let us examine some of the passages bearing upon the subject.

Take first the passage found in Acts 14 : 23, referring to the ordination of elders by Paul and Barnabas in the churches which they had founded and were then revisiting and confirming in the faith. "And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed." *Χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν*, *i. e.* they appointed or placed over these churches elders or pastors who might lead and direct them—not *one* elder in each church, but *several* elders in each: *πρεσβυτερους*. *Χειροτονεῖν* signifies: *to raise the hands; to vote, elect, by stretching out the hands.* The expression has by some therefore been taken to mean that these elders were elected or chosen first by the vote of the people, expressed by the uplifting of the hand, and that this election thus expressed was then afterward ratified by the apostles by the laying on of hands or ordination. This is the view of the passage taken by Chemnitz: "Paul and Barnabas," he says, "ordained elders in every church established by them. But they did not assume the right and authority exclusively of electing and installing pastors; but Luke uses the word *χειροτονήσαντες*, which (2 Cor. 8 : 19) is used concerning the election which took place by the vote of the congregation; the same being taken from a Greek usage, giving their votes by stretching forth the hand, and signifies the investing of some one with the office by votes, to designate him or give their consent." But, as *Bloomfield* (in loco) has said, this sense of the passage "requires a very strained interpretation to be put on *χειροτονησαντες*, and one moreover which is forbidden by the *αυτους* following."

And he adds: "There is, indeed, no point on which the most learned have been so much agreed as this, that χειροτονησας here simply denotes "having *selected*, *constituted*, *appointed*. See Hammond, Whitby, Wolf, and especially Kuinoel." And Olshausen says: "The expression in verse 23 is a peculiar one, χειροτονήσαντες αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους, *electing for them elders*." "It does not," he adds, "permit us to suppose there was a free choice on the part of the church, but intimates that the Apostles *themselves* sought out the parties qualified for office." This ordaining of elders or pastors by Paul and Barnabas was then, we hold, according to the natural and grammatical sense of the text, the act of the Apostles themselves, and does not include in any way the active participation of the congregation. We may suppose, of course, that the congregation fully acquiesced in the choice and ordination which the apostles thus made, and heartily and gladly accepted those thus ordained as their pastors, but there is, we maintain, no basis whatever in the text for the inference that the congregation first chose them as pastors, or by election gave them the ministerial call, and that the apostles then afterward simply by ordination confirmed or ratified that call.

But, take next the passages (2 Tim. 1 : 6; 1 Tim. 4 : 14) which refer to the ordination or induction into the ministerial office of Timothy, and it already appears that, not the people, but the ministry performed the act. In Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy (1 : 6) he puts him in remembrance to "stir up the gift of God which is in him by the putting on of Paul's hands," and therefore also commands him to "hold fast the form of sound words" which he had heard of Paul, thus showing that Paul, by virtue of the grace given him of the Lord Jesus in bestowing upon him the office of an apostle, had also instructed Timothy and had appointed him to the holy office. And that Paul, in thus ordaining Timothy to the ministerial office, had not acted alone, nor with the consent or suffrage or co-operation of any congregation, but in Ministerium, or along with other teachers and pastors or fellow presbyters, is evident from the language (1 Tim. 4 : 14) where he writes: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given

thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the *Presbytery.*" *Τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*: "the eldership of that district to which Timothy belonged laid hands on him," says Wiesinger. "Con-fraternity of presbyters, at the place where Timothy was ordained (perhaps Lystra) who conjointly with the apostle laid their hands on him," says Ellicott *in loc.* Wholly and only by the ministry, then, was Timothy examined, chosen, ordained, or inducted into the ministry.

Look now, in the next place, at the directions which Paul gives both to Timothy and to Titus with regard to the ordination of men to the ministry, and the position for which we are contending becomes yet more manifest. From the directions thus given, two things are evident, viz.: first that the apostles authorized those whom they ordained to ordain others and thus perpetuate the ministerial office, and secondly that they *alone* were thus authorized to ordain. Paul writes to Titus: "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, ('one in one city, many in many'—Bp. Taylor—quoted by Ellicott *in loc.*) as I had appointed thee." How absolutely *individual* is not here the apostolic direction and authorization! How free from even the faintest intimation of such a thing as "the voice of the congregation," or "ordaining by the consent or order or authority of the congregation!" To Titus personally was the apostolic authority accorded, and by him personally, governed by his own judgment in each case, was that apostolic authority also to be exercised. To Timothy the Apostle gives in substance the same directions: "Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus; and the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2: 1–2). And again (1 Tim. 5: 22) he solemnly charges him: "Lay hands suddenly on no man," *i. e.* that he should not ordain any man to the ministerial office with undue haste, or without first becoming thoroughly acquainted with him and well assured of his entire fitness for it. And here again the authority to admit to the ministerial office, as

in the directions to Titus, is entirely personal. Timothy, as an ordained minister, has full authority given him to ordain others; and there is again not the slightest intimation that this authority is to be exercised only in connection with or at the request of some congregation! And "when to all this we add the fact that, in connection with these directions thus to set apart teachers, as he himself had set them apart, Paul gives both to Timothy and Titus the particular qualifications which they are to look for in proper candidates for the holy office, and commands them to use great circumspection in the exercise of this right, we have the strongest scriptural assurance as to what construction the Apostles placed upon the authority with which Christ invested them and the course which they took in its exercise." (Ev. Review, vol. xi., p. 329).

But there are other passages which are often cited, and which, we are told, clearly prove that ordination or the call to the ministry was *not* thus the independent and exclusive act alone of the ministry, but was the joint act of the ministry and the laity, or the act of the whole Church. The people, we are told, gave the call by electing whom they would as their pastors, and this congregational choice was then subsequently confirmed in the ordination by the ministry of those whom the people or congregation had thus called: *i. e.* that the people had a voice or vote, and indeed a very controlling one, in determining who should be admitted to the ministerial office, or to whom the ministerial call should be given.

The passage, *e. g.*, in Acts 6 : 2–3, is often thus cited. We confess, however, with all possible respect for the judgment of those who thus cite it, that we are unable to discover the least pertinency or relevancy in it to the question at issue. The election of those seven men to serve as officers in the church at Jerusalem was a purely congregational matter, and, of course, the members of the congregation were entitled to a voice in its determination. They were laymen *before* they were thus chosen and set apart as deacons, and they were, so far as that affected them, equally laymen *afterward*. Several

of them, it is true, did subsequently become preachers of the Gospel, or incumbents of the ministerial office, but they did not become such by this election and ordination. In this transaction, in which, it is freely admitted, the people elected and the apostles then appointed or set apart by the laying on of hands, they were merely elected and set apart to attend to a certain expressed and well defined congregational or local work, viz. to administer rightly what is called "*the daily ministration*," to "*serve tables*," to take charge, as we read, of "*this business.*" The passage therefore, we hold, is utterly irrelevant to the point at issue, and hence proves really nothing either way with regard to the question whether the people, in apostolic days, had a voice in determining to whom the ministerial call should be given.

Another of the passages constantly cited by the advocates of the right of the laity to take part in the bestowal of the ministerial call in favor of their position, is the passage, Acts 15, containing the record of the Council or Synod which was held at Jerusalem to adjust or determine the question whether circumcision, under the Christian dispensation, was a condition of salvation, which had been referred to it by the church at Antioch. Laymen, we are confidently told, "were present at this first ecclesiastical council, and took an active part in all its proceedings;" and, on the assumption that all this was, beyond a doubt, really so, we are further and frequently told that thus also should it now and always, in all ecclesiastical conventions, be, and especially in all those in which the Church determines so important a matter as the matter to whom the call to the office of the ministry should be given. But here again, as in the preceding citation, there are a number of things unproved and merely assumed, upon which however the entire argument is founded, and in consequence of which the whole conclusion is therefore invalidated. What real proof, *e. g.*, is there that "*the certain other of them*" who are mentioned as coming up with Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem were lay delegates from the church at Antioch? What real proof is there that a single layman uttered a word or cast a ballot in the council or synod? What real proof

indeed is there even of the presence of a layman in the council or synod, in an official capacity, or as constituting an official and authoritative part of the council or synod? We are bold to say that not one of these things, can from the passage, be clearly and satisfactorily *proven.* To us it is evident that the only parties actively participating were the commissioners Paul and Barnabas and the "certain other of them," most probably elders or ministers from Antioch, and the elders and apostles at Jerusalem. These, we believe, were the only active participants in the proceedings. Paul and Barnabas were sent, not to confer with the multitude, but to confer with "*the apostles and elders* about this question;" and we read (v. 6) "and *the apostles and elders* came together for to consider of this matter." And whilst the sessions were evidently open to the congregation, and large numbers of the people were present, (v. 12) and whilst after the deliberations and decisions it is said, "then pleased it the apostles and elders, *with the whole Church*, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas," and whilst we also read: "the apostles, and elders and *brethren* send greeting unto the brethren," still there is no proof that others than apostles and elders actually participated, and what is spoken of as thus having been the pleasure and message of "the whole church" and of "the brethren," may all be harmonized with what precedes upon the assumption that the apostles and elders acted in the case, so far as the church was concerned, *representatively*, *i. e.* in the name of the Church. "The whole plea," writes another, "of the lay participation turns on the terms "*the whole Church*," and "*brethren.*" In regard to the first of these terms it occurs in connection with their resolving to send chosen men to accompany Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, and the other is rendered doubtful by the reading of the best manuscripts. The famous Codex Sinaiticus is against the term "*brethren*" as referring to persons separate from the apostles and elders. In this view Alford concurs. We have, then, little more than the shadow of a shadow of any active participation of the laity in this so-called synod, and, if they did have any participation, it still

has no bearing on the question at issue. For, it was a question, not of the ministry, but one affecting every member of the Church, and in which every lay member had direct and personal interest." (QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. iii., p. 102).

But the the *locus classicus* with those who regard the laity as entitled to participation in the admission of men to the office of the ministry, is the record (Acts 1 : 15–26) of the election and ordination of an apostle to take the place of Judas who, "by transgression, fell, that he might go to his own place." "Here," we are told with an air of triumph, "we have even the choice of an apostle by the multitude of the disciples, the whole Church participating;" and *a fortiori*, if the laity thus had part in the election or choice of an apostle, should they not now have the same in the call to the office of the ministry?

This choice of a successor to Judas, upon which they lean so heavily for support of their position, will not, we are satisfied, if it is carefully and impartially considered, furnish them even the least reliable and satisfactory support. In the first place, the validity of the whole proceeding may very properly be questioned. The fact that of Matthias, thus elected to the apostleship, no further record whatever exists in scripture; the fact that this election took place before the special outpouring of the Holy Ghost, on the day of Pentecost, for which the apostles had been commanded by Christ to wait, thus making this a hasty act, performed, if not against the command of Christ, yet, at least, without it; the fact that Christ Himself afterward chose Paul as one of His inspired apostles; and the fact that in the Apocalypse (21 : 14) only *twelve* apostles are spoken of, in harmony with the original number constituting the apostolic college; all these facts make it more than probable that this entire transaction was unauthorized, unapproved, and invalid. But admitting for the sake of argument, its validity, we deny, in the second place, that there is proof in the record that there really was, in the strict sense of the word any such thing as an election by the suffrage of the assembled multitude. For possibly, as Dr. J. Addison Alexander suggests, the persons

thus assembled did not vote at all; and, if there really was voting, there is nothing in the record to indicate certainly by whom it was done. Peter it should be noted, in his address (*Worley*) upon the occasion, does not call upon the whole company to take part in the choice, but merely announces to them the necessity, in accordance with prophecy, that such choice be made; and the language in the latter part of the narrative is such that it cannot be said beyond question to include all present in the vote or lot which was cast. "It has been disputed," says Alexander, "whether it was only the eleven or the whole assembly that *gave forth their lots.* The very question assumes, either that this was an election, in the ordinary sense of the expression, or that *lots* means *votes* or *ballots*, which is entirely at variance with the usage of the word, and with the circumstances of this case. This makes it wholly unimportant who performed the mere external act of drawing, shaking or the like." (*Commentary on Acts in loco*).

Our judgment of the transaction is that it took place in the *presence* of the congregation or disciples but was not in any way performed *by* them; that the apostle addressed them as he did, not to invite and prepare them to take part in it, but to explain to them and prepare them to witness what the apostles were then and there about to do; that the apostles themselves, in the nature of the case, could alone know who "had companied with them all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them, beginning with the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from them," and that the apostles themselves therefore, and not the multitude, appointed or selected two, meeting these conditions, and that *they*, after prayer, gave forth or cast lots, thus leaving it to the Lord to show "whether of these two He had chosen to be a witness with them of His resurrection." We incline, indeed, to the opinion that the "*hundred and twenty*," or those designated by the general terms "*disciples*," in whose presence this choice of an apostle thus took place, were not the members of the church at Jerusalem at all, but were the seventy evangelists, and others representing the disciples

or Church of Christ from all parts of the land, who were then, during the season of Pentecost, present in Jerusalem and could easily thus be assembled together; so that, whilst there were yet no organized churches which they represented, or of which they were pastors, they still, in fact, were the representatives or pastors of the unorganized body of believers in various places. But, whether this be so or not, of this we feel certain that there is no evidence in the record to justify the opinion that the multitude present, whoever they may have been, took any direct part in the transaction whatever, much less that they actively participated, and by their ballots or votes decided that Matthias, and not Joseph called Barsabas, should be the successor of Judas. And hence we are also clear that no argnment can justly be drawn from this transaction of thus electing an apostle, to take the place of the traitor Judas, in favor of now allowing to those not themselves in the office of the Gospel ministry to assist in deciding who shall be admitted into it.

Reviewing then, all that we have now said, under this examination of the various scripture texts bearing upon the subject, the argument appears to us conclusive, beyond room for doubt, that the word of God clearly teaches that ministers, and ministers only, should decide who shall be ministers; or, in other words, that to the ministry only has been granted the divine authority and right to give, in the name of the Church, the call to the ministerial office.

But, we proceed now to ask and answer our third and last question, viz:

What is the precise import or character of the act of ordination by which men are thus inducted into the ministerial office?

There are *three* aspects in which ordination may be considered, namely: what it is in itself, what it is as the act of the Church, and what it is as the act of the applicant or person receiving ordination. Let us look at it briefly in each of these aspects.

Ordination, considered merely as a visible or external rite, consists in the laying on of the hands of the ministry, accompanied with prayer, by which imposition of hands and prayer

the recipient is placed in the ministerial office and is clothed by the Church with authority to perform in her midst ministerial functions.

The ceremony of the laying on of hands, always employed by the Church in the ordination of men to the ministerial office, dates back as a ritual of induction into sacred positions and offices, even to the earliest ecclesiastical ages. Joshua, *e. g.*, was thus inducted, by special divine command, into the office to which he was called. (Numb. 27 : 18). Thus also were the seven deacons set apart to their offices. (Acts 6 : 6). Thus also were Paul and Barnabas set apart to their special missionary labors among the Gentiles. (Acts 13 : 3). So also in the ordination of Timothy. (1 Tim. 4 : 14 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 6). The Apostle Paul also bids Timothy "lay hands suddenly on no man," (1 Tim. 5 : 22) showing that "when he wrote these words they had become a well known expression for ordaining to a sacred office. And this mode continued to be used in the Post Apostolic Church as is evidenced by the directions and forms of prayer for ordinations in what are called the apostolic constitutions." (*Jacob's Eccles. Polity of the New Testament*, p. 110).

Whatever, then, we may regard the real import or content of ordination to be, this, at least, is clear, namely, that, as a ceremony, consisting of prayer and the laying on of hands, it possesses divine approbation if not positive divine institution, and it comes down to us clothed with the authority and endowment not only of apostolic practice but also of the continuous and unbroken practice of the Church during all the successive centuries since.

But what, let us now ask, is the import or the content of ordination, as a right of induction into the ministerial office? What is it, not as a mere external ceremony, but in its spiritual or supernatural and divine elements? What character precisely does it possess? Is it only a ceremony, or is it a ceremony in connection with which there are imparted spiritual gifts and graces? In a word, does ordination secure or give anything in the way of endowment or qualification for the office of the ministry from the Holy Ghost?

What the Romish theory concerning the essential character of ordination is, we have already seen. She esteems it as the highest and greatest of the sacraments; "sacramentum ordinis;" that sacrament by which men are fitted and endowed with power by the Holy Ghost to administer rightly all the other sacraments. "Propter ordinem," says Thomas Aquinas, "fit homo dispensator aliorum sacramentorum, ergo ordo habet magis rationem, quod sit sacramentum, quam alia."

The Greek Church takes the same view as does the Romish concerning it, declaring that "Orders are a sacrament, in which the Holy Ghost, by the laying on of the bishop's hands, ordains them that be rightly chosen to minister sacraments, and to feed the flock of Christ." (*Creeds of Christendom*, vol. ii., p. 501).

That ordination is thus a sacrament, in the strict and correct sense of the word, or in the same sense in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are sacraments, all Protestants heartily deny; although, in a certain wide and untechnical sense, our Lutheran confessors and dogmaticians were willing that it should be so called or designated. (Vide *Apology*, vii., 11. *Gerhard*, xii., b. 147).

But, whilst this Romish conception of ordination, as truly a sacrament, is undoubtedly an entirely extreme one, and involves a gross misapprehension of the ministerial office, and is therefore very properly rejected by all Protestant Churches and creeds, the question may still be asked whether many Protestants themselves, in their intense opposition to everything that partakes of a hierarchical principle, have not swung off into an opposite extreme, and, by making little or nothing of ordination, have also, perhaps, like the Romanists, missed the exact truth.

The views, *e. g.*, of Luther and of our earlier Lutheran dogmaticians, which assign to election by the congregation the call to the ministry, and which logically therefore regard ordination as not really necessary, and as being merely a solemn and impressive way of recognizing or publicly declaring that the person ordained has been called, and is by the call which he has already received already also in the ministerial

office, are certainly, in our judgment, thus extreme and utterly untenable when dispassionately considered in the light of God's word. We may not perhaps be able to determine and express what precisely is conferred in this ordination service by which men are inducted into the ministry, but this much to our mind is clear, that the Holy Spirit does confer spiritual gifts and graces of some kind and to some degree; in other words that whilst not in the Romish sense a sacrament, lifting the recipient up into an hierarchical order, and divinely imparting to him priestly and miraculous power or supernatural endowments which he did not before possess and which are indelible and can never be lost, yet also is it not in the extreme Protestant sense a mere ceremony, imparting as the gift of the Holy Ghost no benediction, and leaving the spiritual character and qualifications of the person ordained the same in all respects as though he had not been ordained. This latter view is also, we are satisfied, equally with the former, an unscriptural extreme. In proof that ordination by the laying on of hands and prayer is more than only an empty rite, and that the Holy Ghost does in connection with it impart spiritual blessings to the person ordained, we turn to the word of God.

It is simply a fact that in every instance recorded in the Bible of the imposition of hands, or the extension of hands, accompanied with prayer, the supposition or assumption on the part of all concerned was, not that the act was merely an impressive human ritual, but that there was also something, either good or bad, either bane or benediction, actually and really imparted. "Imposition of hands," says the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, M. A. (*Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii., p. 242) "is a natural form by which benediction has been expressed in all ages and among all people. It is the act of one superior, either by age or spiritual position, towards an inferior, and by its very form it appears to bestow some gift, or to manifest a desire that some gift should be bestowed. It may be an evil thing that is symbolically bestowed, as when guiltiness was thus transferred by the High Priest to the

scape-goat from the congregation, (Lev. 16 : 21); but in general the gift is something good which God is supposed to bestow by the channel of the laying on of hands. Thus, in the Old Testament, Jacob accompanies his blessing to Ephraim and Manasseh with imposition of hands, (Gen. 48 : 14); Joshua is ordained in the room of Moses by imposition of hands, (Numb. 28 : 18; Deut. 34 : 9); cures seem to have been wrought by the prophets by the imposition of hands, (2 Kings 5 : 11); and the high priest giving his solemn benediction stretched out his hands over the people, (Lev. 9: 22). The same form was used by our Lord in blessing, and occasionally in healing, and it was plainly regarded by the Jews as customary or befitting, (Matt. 19 : 13; Mark 8 : 23; 10 : 16). One of the promises also, at the end of St. Mark's Gospel, to Christ's followers is that they should cure the sick by laying on of hands, (Mark 16 : 18); and accordingly we find that Saul received his sight, (Acts 9 : 17) and Publius' father was healed of his fever (Acts 28 : 8) by imposition of hands."

Tracing, then, the history of the laying on of hands, as we find it recorded in the Scriptures, there was evidently, all along in its history, the supposition or belief that there was, through or by it, an actual *impartation* of something, a going forth or communication of either positive blessing or curse, a production of some real and true result.

In further confirmation of this, and especially in connection with the laying on of hands as part of the ceremony of induction into the ministerial office, let us examine carefully the precise sense of several texts bearing directly upon the subject.

Let us examine, first, the text (Numb. 27 : 18) in which Moses is commanded to ordain Joshua as his successor. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him." By some it is maintained that here there could evidently have been no communication of the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands, since it is explicitly asserted that Joshua already possessed the Spirit, and because of his possession of Him he

was thus selected and ordained. "In whom is the spirit." Thus one writer (*McClintock and Strong*, vol. iv., p. 58) says: "Here it is obvious that the laying on of hands did neither originate nor communicate divine gifts, for Joshua had 'the spirit' before he received imposition of hands."

But, in opposition to this interpretation of the text, we deny that the Hebrew word (רוּחַ) Ruach here signifies the Holy Spirit as one of the Persons of the Trinity, or that there is any reference whatever in the use of the term to any supernatural or gracious work wrought by the Holy Ghost in the character of Joshua. The term evidently has reference only to the *natural* endowments of Joshua, the spirit of prudence, of courage, of energy, of force and decision of character which he was endowed with and which naturally fitted him for the leadership of the people. "Understanding,"—"Insight"—"Courage"—are the meanings given of the word, as it here stands in this text, by Fuerst in his Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. Hence the expression "in whom is the spirit," does not mean "in whom is the *Holy Spirit*," but simply that in him was a natural spirit, or natural elements of character, fitting him, when once quickened and directed by the Holy Ghost, and supplemented by still other and higher gifts and graces, to be the leader of the Israelitish nation. In his ordination, by the laying on of Moses' hands, the Holy Spirit added to these natural elements of character or this natural spirit, such other spiritual elements and power as might still be needed in order entirely to qualify him for the right discharge of the duties of his position. Or, as Bush (*in loco*) remarks: "By this ceremony of the imposition of hands was signified the transfer of the office of leader of Israel from Moses to Joshua, and the communication of the requisite spiritual gifts and endowments for its right discharge;" corresponding with what is plainly taught in the parallel passage (Deut. 34 : 9): "And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom, *for* (כִּי=nam, γάρ, or quia, ὅτι, a causal particle) Moses had laid his hand upon him."

But, in further confirmation of this truth that in the lay-

ing on of hands in ordination there is an actual communication, to the person ordained, of a spiritual gift or power from the Holy Ghost, of some character, let us examine the two passages in Paul's letters to Timothy upon the subject. "Neglect not the gift (*μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος*) that is in thee, which was given (*ὅ ἐδόθη σοι*) thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," (1 Tim. 4 : 14). "Wherefore, I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on off my hands, (*Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἀναμιμνήσκω σε ἀναζωπυρεῖν τό χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου*). The word *χάρισμα* which in both these texts is translated "gifts," and which in each designates something conferred in or through the laying on of hands, occurs, says Ellicott (1 Tim. 4 : 14) "with the exception of 1 Peter 4 : 19, only in St. Paul's Epistles, where it is found as many as fourteen times, and in all cases denotes a gift emanating from the Holy Spirit or the free grace of God. Here probably, as the context suggests, it principally refers to the gifts of *παράκλησις* and *διδασκαλία* just specified. The parallel passage (2 Tim. 1 : 6) clearly develops the force of the preposition (*ἀναζωπυρεῖν*): the *χαρισμα* is as a spark of holy fire within him which he is not to let die out from want of attention." Again: "The *ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν* or *χειροθεσία* was a symbolic action, the outward sign of an inward communication of the Holy Spirit for some spiritual office (Acts 6 : 6) or undertaking (Acts 13 : 3) implied or expressed." And again: "Prophecy and imposition of hands were the two co-existent circumstances which make up the whole process, by the medium of which the *χάρισμα* was imparted." (*Ellicott* on 1 Tim. 4 : 14). Bloomfield's comment on the passage (1 Tim. 4 : 14) is as follows: "Notwithstanding that this must chiefly allude to the spiritual *gifts* which Timothy had received, it may include the ordinary *graces* of the Spirit, by which his endowments in learning would be sanctified. These were given *δια προφητείας, i. e.* according to prophecy; of which the passage (1 : 18) is the best commentary," prophecies probably which some of the New Testament prophets had uttered con-

cerning Timothy before he was put into the ministry. The comments of Wiessinger (*Olshausen's Commentary, in loc.*, vol. vi., p. 113) on these two related or parallel texts (1 Tim. 4 : 14; 2 Tim. 1 : 6) are very full, and, in our judgment, very judicious and correct. *Χάρισμα,* he says, "denotes the gift of the divine Spirit, that gift which qualifies him (Timothy) for the preaching of the Gospel, for the work of an evangelist (2 Tim. 4 : 5) and which he had to make use of at present in the service of a particular church. On the *ἐν σοί,* compare 2 Tim. 1 : 6, where the gift is represented as a spark of the Spirit lying within him, the kindling of which depends on the will of him on whom the gift is bestowed. So here, also, the use of the *χάρισμα* is made to depend on the will of Timothy. * * With respect to the *laying on of hands*, compare Acts 13 : 3, where we read that hands were laid in prayer on the apostle Paul and on Barnabas, by the prophets and teachers at Antioch, in order to separate them *for the work* to which they were called, Acts 6 : 6, where we read that, in like manner, hands were laid in prayer by the apostles on the newly elected deacons, in order to impart to them the gift of the Spirit for their ministry. It is in every case an appropriation of the gift of the Spirit in prayer, through the instrumentality of others, for a definite object, for a *work* which is undertaken, or a service which is entered upon, whether this service be marked out in a standing office or not." Again, on 2 Tim. 1 : 6, he remarks: "But, what does this *χάρισμα* denote? The term itself in its wide signification, (Rom. 1 : 11; 5 : 15; 6 : 23; 9 : 29, comp. with 12 : 6; 1 Cor. 12 : 4, seq.) leaves it undecided; yet we may perhaps determine it from the connection, as verses 6 and 7 manifestly introduce verse 8 seq. (*οὖν*) and from the comparison of 1 Tim. 4 : 14 and 1 : 18. As there *χάρισμα* can be understood only of his definite gift for the vocation of teacher, so also here. And the whole tenor of the epistle (to which verse 6 is, as it were, the key) points to Timothy's vocation as a teacher, not to his Christian deportment, the *δι ἣν αἰτίαν* of verse 6, in fact, assuming his *faith* as ground of the admonition to fidelity in his official calling. The reference is not to the gift of the

Spirit in general, but to the specific gift requisite for his calling; and this not, with Mack, that of *government*, but that of *evangelist*. So also Olshausen. The relative clause 'which is in thee,' etc., refers to the same act as in 1 Tim. 4 : 14, viz.: Timothy's reception of his evangelical calling by prophecy and imposition of hands. Regarding, as every unprejudiced person must do, the two passages as having a like reference, we see how groundlessly this setting apart is regarded as a consecration of Timothy to the bishopric of Ephesus, a formal inauguration to the office of priest or bishop. To any *presiding* over the Ephesian Chuch, or over any other Church, there is here not the slightest allusion." Dr. Van Oosterzee, on the first of these texts, (1 Tim. 4 : 14) remarks: "At his entrance on the office of teacher, Timothy received by the Holy Ghost, a special gift of high value in the exercise of his office. The office itself is not here denoted, but his divine qualification for the office, which was given through (*διά*) prophecy with the laying on of hands of the elders," (*Lange's Com. in loco*). And again, on 2 Tim. 1 : 6, he remarks: "The Apostle here, as 1 Tim. 4 : 14, alludes to the gift of the calling (Lehrberuf) received from God, and addresses Timothy not as a Christian simply, but chiefly as teacher."

Bearing in mind what these eminent biblical critics thus express, it appears, therefore, to us clear that in the ordination of Timothy by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, of which the apostle was one, there was, in that solemn transaction, communicated to him, by the Holy Ghost, as a special gift or *χάρισμα*, above what he before or without such ordination possessed, not sacramental or miraculous and divine power such as Romanists claim that ordination confers, but special moral or spiritual power with special regard to the distinctive work of a religious teacher or Christian minister and pastor to which he was then and there thus consecrated; a special impartation indeed of the Holy Ghost Himself by which, if he would subsequently avail himself rightly of this presence and offered power of the Holy Ghost within him, the natural endowments which he possessed would be quickened into new and increasing activity and

effectiveness, and his utterance of the truth be clothed with resistless power over the hearts and consciences of men. In a word, in his ordination, through the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, the Holy Ghost was so communicated to him as, in all respects, to qualify him for the right and for the successful exercise of the functions of the ministerial office.

Nor do we here, for a moment, in thus asserting that the Holy Ghost was imparted in ordination to Timothy by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, attach any magical or *ex opere operato* power to the mere manual or tactual act itself. The Holy Ghost is not imparted because the hands of the presbytery are thus imposed, nor through that even as a necessary outward and material medium, but He is imparted, we still hold, in connection with it, and as God's answer to the prayers and faith in the promises of His word which His Church there in that solemn hour pours out before Him.

And this even Gerhard, (xii., b. 168) although, as seems to us, quite inconsistently, admits. "We no not deny," is his language, "that, in ordination, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, necessary for the discharge of the duties of the ministry of the Church, are conferred and increased; yet meanwhile," he adds, "we make a distinction between the grace of reconciliation, or of the remission of sins, and the grace of ordination, since many receive the grace of ordination who nevertheless do not receive the grace of reconciliation; secondly, we say that the bestowal and increase of the gifts necessary for the ministry, are by no means to be ascribed to the laying on of the hands as a sacramental symbol truly so called, and divinely appointed, but to the prayers of the Church and the presbytery, to which the promise of hearing has been attached."

But, if in the case of Timothy there was such impartation, in the act of ordination, of the Holy Ghost, then also, we have every reason to think, is there now in the case of all who, possessing the requisite natural gifts and Christian character, present themselves to the ministerium or presbytery, as the proper official organ of the Church, and at their hands receive ordination. In all essential respects the cases are the same.

We like, upon this whole subject, the views of Martensen (*Christian Dogmatics*, Sect. 272) who says: "In the Lutheran Church preachers are ordained according to the apostolic method by laying on of the hands of the brethren—an emblem of the bestowment of spiritual gifts—yet we cannot rank priestly ORDERS on the same footing with the sacraments properly so called, and we cannot suppose that extraordinary, gifts are connected therewith, as they were in the apostles times. And, withal, as little can we suppose that ordination is a mere ceremony in which *nothing* is conferred. For the office appointed by the Lord, in its very idea, seems to include a *power* and *authority* from the Lord Himself, and must, *to a certain extent*, be accompanied with the promises that were in an extraordinary manner fulfilled in the case of the apostles and evangelists whom our Lord sent forth. "I will give you," said Christ, "a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist," (Luke 21 : 15). From this authority, resting in the office as coming from the Lord Himself, appointing the preacher as servant, not of the Church only, but of the Lord, is developed the special priestly gift of performing the service for the building up of the fellowship, and of preaching words of warning and of comfort; a gift and an anointing that cannot be found in an orderly manner among those who lack that authority, because they possess only a subjective or human call. Although the Lutheran Church has not ventured to propound a dogma regarding priestly ordination, owing to a certain fear of the hierarchical principle, the faith nevertheless exists within her pale, that ordination is *more* than a mere ceremony, as it is also the express witness of faithful ministers, that they have ever derived new strength and energy for the work of their office *in their ordination*. It is evident that the gift of grace, lying hid in the office, does not always appear in power, but depends for its activity upon faith and continued personal and ethical endeavor. "Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."

What is true regarding the administration of the sacrament, that it must be conditional upon the inner state of the receiver, holds good also of ordination. It must be given to him only who possesses the inner preparation and the due qualifications for the office, and hence also Paul warns Timothy not to lay hands suddenly on any man."

But, apart from what ordination thus is in itself, it may also be considered *as the act of the Church.* As such it is, first, an act of *recognition;* in which the Church recognizes and acknowledges the applicant to possess the required scriptural qualifications for the office of the ministry. It is, secondly, an act of *committing* or *entrusting.* The Church has a divine mission; she has precious possessions and interests; she has solemn and blessed means of grace. That mission is the glory of Christ in the sanctification of the Church and the conversion of the world. Those possessions and interests are all the various activities and institutions by which she is seeking to secure and promote that glory. And those means of grace are the word and blessed sacraments. And all these, in the act of ordination, the Church gives over, as a sacred trust, to be cared for and defended and helped, in every possible way, by him whom she thus ordains. The divine word, *e. g.*, she gives into his hands, and bids him preach it in its purity and with all fidelity. The holy sacraments she entrusts to him and charges him rightly to administer them. Her history she gives him to study, to be inspired by, and to respect; her polity to to know, esteem, and obey; her pure doctrine to understand, love, and, even at the peril of his life, to proclaim and defend; her institutions of learning to cherish and support; her literature to read and circulate; her system and schools of education to sustain and improve; her cause of missions and the world's evangelization to plead and pray for; all these interests, which are the interests of the kingdom of Christ, the Church, and Christ also through the Church, in that act of ordination, give over, as their solemn trust, to him whom they thus induct into the ministry. Thus Paul wrote to Timothy (2 Tim. 1 : 14) "That good thing which was *committed* unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in

us;" and in another place: "O, Timothy, keep that which is *committed* to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: which some professing, have erred concerning the faith," (1 Tim. 6 : 20–21). But thirdly, ordination, as the act of the Church, is an act also of *delegation* and *spiritual subjection.* She delegates to him authority to exercise in her midst the functions of the ministerial office. She commissions him, in the name of her ascended Lord, to preach the word and to administer the sacraments. And she places herself under his spiritual tuition and rule, recognizing him as the ambassador of Christ, and pledging herself to receive from his mouth and hands the word and sacraments as from the very mouth and hands of Christ Himself, even as Christ also declares: "He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me," (Matt. 10 : 40); or as the apostle declares: "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God," (2 Cor. 5 : 20); or, as he writes to the Hebrews, (13 : 17), "*Obey* them that have the rule over you and *submit* yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you." And hence, while ministers are not a separate and superior *order*, and are not to "be *lords over God's heritage*," (1 Peter 5 : 3) their office still invests them with authority, and the duty of the Church is to acknowledge and submit herself obediently to that authority in so far as its exercise harmonizes with the principles of the word of God.

But ordination, we yet remark, may also be considered as *the act of the person receiving it, or of the person ordained.* As such it is a solemn act of entire consecration, if it be God's will for life, to the special work of the ministry. Inwardly moved to it by the Holy Ghost, and now outwardly called to it by the voice of the Church, he, in the act of ordination, devotes himself, in most solemn covenant, henceforth, with all his time and power, to the one sublime work of promoting the glory of Christ in the exercise of the func-

tions of the ministerial office. It is a personal consecration; a consecration of the whole man, body, mind, soul; a consecration to the one single but grand work of the gospel ministry; a consecration to it until death. Hence, whilst not believing in any priestly "*character indelibilis*" imparted in ordination, and whilst believing that demission of the ministerial office is under certain circumstances both justifiable and obligatory, we yet hold that for any one, with suitable gifts, once ordained to the ministry, and physically and mentally capable to discharge its duties, for the mere sake of gain to turn aside and engage in purely secular pursuits, is a great and soul-endangering sin. And yet how many men there are in our land, to-day, who, while still retaining the official prefix of "*Reverend*," and retaining it and publishing it as so much capital in trade, although in health and able, were their hearts right, to do good work for Christ in the ministry, are engaged in all kinds of merely secular and worldly vocations; so that with the good lay brother out West the whole Church may to-day well pray: "From all ministerial land speculators, from all reverend life-insurance agents, from all clerical pill pedlars and patent medicine venders, from all ordained store-keepers and agriculturists, Good Lord deliver us!"

And sinful, also, beyond expression is it for those who have once, in ordination, solemnly consecrated themselves to the work of the ministry, forgetful of their solemn ordination vows, then afterward with only half heart and with but feeble devotion, to prosecute that work. So morally great is the work of the ministry in itself; so solemn are the promises made in the assumption of the office; so dependent the prosperity of the Church and the conversion of the world upon its faithful prosecution; so responsible for the loss of immortal souls who perish through ministerial indifference or negligence; so capable, with God's blessing upon the preached truth, to reach and change multitudes into the image of Christ and be the means of bringing them to the enjoyment of Christ and Heaven forever; and so rapidly hastening, as both preacher and hearer are, to that august judg-

ment throne where we shall all be adjudged guilty or guiltless of the blood of each other's souls; oh how earnest, how entirely consecrated to his work, how fervent and unwearied and burning with zeal, yea what a very flame of holy fire, should every minister of the Gospel be! Of Richard Baxter it is said: "When he spoke of weighty soul concerns, you might find his very spirit drenched therein." Paul writes to the Romans: "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart; for I could wish that myself were accursed (separated) from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh." And our Saviour Himself, unwavering in His devotion to the unselfish and sublime work of saving souls to which he had given Himself, exclaims: "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work." In each how full, how entire, the consecration! How steadfast and earnest and self-consuming their zeal! How true, in all things, to their ministerial call! Oh, that all who preach the word had such a spirit! Oh that all who bear the vessels of the Lord were also thus entirely consecrated to their holy and blessed work!

In now closing our discussion of this subject of the *Call to the Ministry* we know of no more fitting thought or language with which to do so, than we find in the following "*Suspirium*" with which Hollazius (*De Ministerio Ecclesiastico*) concludes his able discussion of the same:

Te, Deus, Pater omnis boni ordinis, Auctor ministerii sacri, sinceris humillimisque precibus obtestor, ut Hierarchiam tuam Ecclesiasticam, quam mortalium commodo sapientissime instituisti, adversus fremitum orbis et orci integram et incorruptam conserves! Da ministris tuis plantantibus et rigantibus incrementum uberrimum! Da etiam mihi ministro tuo infirmo os et sapientiam; Confer dona sanctificantia; adde animum imperterritum; largire prosperos officii successus, ut ad praescriptum verbi tui recte doceam, Sacramenta rite dispensem, pie vivam, et ex hac vita tanquam ex hospitio, non tanquam ex domo, Te jubente, placide discedam.

ARTICLE II.

HOME MISSION AND CHURCH EXTENSION WORK AMONG LUTHERANS, ESPECIALLY IN THE GREAT NORTH-WEST.

By S. W. HARKEY, D. D., Washington, Illinois.

"The field is the world," and the command of the Master, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." In this broad view, our work of Missions and Church Extension is in all places, not only whither our people have scattered, but wherever man is found—in the North and the South, the East and the West, on the continents and the islands, among the mountains and the valleys, in the forests and prairies, in every country, city, town and hamlet. Our labors must continue until the glory which radiates from the cross of Jesus shall sweetly beam on every human habitation, and illuminate every heart.

Our Church has an eye to *permanency* in her work. She does not send out "*Evangelists*," to hold "big meetings" here and there, and get up an excitement among the people, and then leave the sheep to be scattered again without a fold and a home. She does not think it well to cut down the harvest and leave the sheaves lie in the field unshocked and ungarnered. She aims to establish permanent congregations, settle permanent pastors over them, and have them build houses of worship, and parsonages, and institutions of education and mercy. She really has no use for *flying* ministers, who, after a few months, always find "a lion in the way," and are off for a new place even before he roars. All such brethren have either entirely missed their calling, or certainly greatly misunderstood it.

It is the design of this article to survey the whole field of Lutheranism, in its evangelistic labors, in the great valley of the Mississippi, under the impression that we may gather some most important lessons therefrom. No part or Synod of our

Lutheran Zion, of whatever language or nation, represented on this territory, by which the true Gospel of Christ is preached, will be ignored in this review. We wish to see not what a part, but the whole Church has accomplished—say in thirty years last past.

And first, the field itself—its extent and the amount and value of its material. It would include the States of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and small portions of Texas and Colorado. It is a district of country more than one thousand miles square, the very garden of the United States. Its immense natural advantages, as fertility of soil, salubrity of climate, vast supplies of coal and other minerals, navigable rivers, and the like, warrant us in saying, that it can support tens of millions of people beyond the numbers who now have their homes here, and that it will be sure to have them at no distant day.

There is now a Lutheran population upon this territory of at least one million and a half. Some have estimated the number at much higher figures. But drawing my conclusions from the published statistics of all the Churches, I am prepared to say that one million, five hundred thousand, is a fair estimate. And they have found their homes here chiefly within the last thirty years. These multitudes are made up of immigrants from different Eastern States, but especially from various parts of Europe, and they use several languages in their church services, especially the German, Swedish, Norwegian or Danish, and the English. They are a most substantial part of our population here—already a mighty power in the land. "Certainly the German and Scandinavians and their descendants have a future in America, if any people have;—a most important future. They are among our most valuable citizens, and will aid mightily in moulding the character and shaping the destinies of this nation. They are industrious, economical, honest and prosperous. They own vast bodies of our best lands, and, unlike the Irish, always make themselves homes. You need only inquire for the best lands, and you will be sure to find the Germans and Scandi-

navians there. They are our farmers and mechanics, and many of them are becoming our merchants and bankers. They are not much given to speculation, nor fond of change in matters of religion—are not easily taken by every new fangled theory or notion, and will remain in the Lutheran Church, if she does her duty towards them, and furnishes them with the spiritual supplies which they require."

Let us look, in the second place, at the work which has already been accomplished among them. Thirty years ago we Lutherans had nothing, or next to nothing, on all the territory named. Here and there, in several of these States, a few scattered members of our Church were found, and a few feeble congregations had been organized, but it amounted to only a very small beginning. It was indeed a day of small things. Vast portions of the country were yet a complete wilderness, traversed only by the savage Indian, buffalo, and wild deer. What have we now? We have twenty-seven Synods, 1702 ministers, 3001 churches, and 367,180 communicants. Surely this is a most wonderful showing in the work of Home Missions and Church Extension. There is no denomination in the land, except the Methodists, that can make anything like such an exhibition. Of these district Synods, ten are connected with the General Synod, with 265 ministers, 324 churches, and 19,950 communicants; four are connected with the General Council, having 191 ministers, 414 churches, and 51,713 communicants; six are in the Synodical Conference, with 956 ministers, 1532 churches, and 243,340 communicants: and outside of these three General Bodies, there are seven Synods, with 290 ministers, 731 churches, and 52,177 communicants.

It is proper to remark, that a few of the ministers and churches connected with several of the Synods named are located in other States than those embraced in the territory under review, but they are nevertheless part of the fruits of the same missionary work, and the Synods are in the West. I ought also to mention "the German Evangelical Synod of North America," found mainly in the valley of the Mississippi, with its 348 ministers, 425 churches, and 70,000 com-

municants. I have not included these Christians in the above estimate, because they do not call themselves Lutherans, although, with the Heidelberg catechism, they do also adopt the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Catechism, and so far are Lutherans.

Of the Synods referred to, eight are German, namely, joint Synod of Missouri, Synod of Illinois, Synod of Wisconsin, Synod of Minnesota, Synod of Iowa, Synod of Michigan, Synod of Texas, and the Wartburg Synod, mainly in Illinois. These together have 1023 ministers, 1358 churches, and 208,405 communicants. Among the Scandinavians there are nine Synods, as follows: Swedish Ansgari; Swedish Augustana Synod, Synod for the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, Hauge's Norwegian Synod in America, Conference for the Norwegian Danish Lutheran Church, Swedish Evangelic Lutheran Mission Synod, Norwegian Augustana Synod, Immanuel Synod, and Danish Church in America. These Scandinavian Synods together have 452 ministers, 1323 churches, and 141,681 communicants.

We have ten English Synods, as follows: Synod of Northern Indian, Olive Branch Synod of Indiana, Synod of Northern Illinois, Synod of Central Illinois, Synod of Southern Illinois, Synod of Iowa, Synod of Kansas, Synod of Nebraska, Synod of Indiana, and English Conference of Missouri. These together have 227 ministers, 320 churches, and 17,094 communicants. And the grand total, as I have stated, is 27 Synods, 1702 ministers, 3001 churches, and 367,180 communicants. If I should add the "German Evangelical Synod of North America, it would swell the nnmber to twenty-eight Synods, 2050 ministers, 3426 churches, and 437,180 communicants.

In the same time these 3000 congregations have built at 2000 churches, which, at the low estimate of $3000 each on an average, (and in several of our Western cities, the Lutherans have some hundred thousand dollar churches), required them to raise, for this purpose alone, no less than *six millions* of dollars; and I have no doubt that the actual sum is much higher. When it is considered that all this has been done by

poor immigrants or new comers in a new country, where all other improvements had to be made—homes procured, houses built, roads, bridges, school-houses, court-houses and all public and private buildings erected, and in which our people must bear their share—we are perfectly amazed at the result. Look at this, all ye who are in the habit of talking about the Lutheran people as being miserly, and our grand old Church as having lost all vitality, and are casting about for some new machinery to galvanize her into life again.

But these Western Lutherans have not only built houses of worship, but they have also procured pastors, or educated them among themselves, and supported them, with comparatively very little foreign aid, and sustained the worship of God and means of grace, at an expense still greater, by far, than the cost of their churches, and they are doing all this to-day nobly.

Nor is this all that they have done and are doing. They have established and are sustaining large and powerful Literary and Theological Institutions, and Academies, in various places, and Parochial Schools almost without number, costing many hundreds of thousands of dollars. We have upon the territory under review seven Theological Seminaries, seven Colleges, and at least a dozen Academies. Several of these institutions are large and powerful, as Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, Carthage College at Carthage, Illinois, Swedish Augustana College and Seminary at Rock Island, Illinois, Luther College of the Norwegians at Decorah, Iowa, North Western University of the Wisconsin Synod at Watertown, Wisconsin, Concordia College at Fort Wayne, Indiana, and others. In the several Theological Institutions and Departments there are at this time twenty professors employed, and they have in the whole about three hundred theological students; and in the Colleges and Academies I can count sixty-six professors, and over 1500 hundred students, though I have not been able to complete the list. Almost all these institutions are in a flourishing condition and doing an immense work.

In English we have hitherto been content, with one or two exceptions, to get our papers and Church literature from the East; but not so the Germans and Scandinavians. On the territory named the Germans have fifteen different periodical publications, the Norwegians nine, the Swedes six, and the Danes three, making together thirty-three publications, besides many books of different sorts.

If the 1700 ministers on this territory receive, on an average, an annual salary of $400 each, it will amount to $680,000 a year to be raised by these people for this purpose alone.

I have known some instances of most remarkable liberality in giving to the cause of the church among these Lutherans of the Northwest. I knew a small Swedish congregation of poor people some years ago, in the northern part of Illinois, who united, and, by the utmost effort and self denial, built quite a good stone church. When it was under roof, but the windows not yet put in, there came one of those terrible storms, to which we are subject, and lifted off the roof, and otherwise so much injured the building, that it was little else than a heap of ruins. What was to be done now? It seemed utterly impossible for them to rebuild. They called a meeting at the scene of destruction, and, led by their minister, engaged in earnest prayer to God. They had no money, but strong hands and willing hearts. They agreed to pledge their wages, as most of them were hirelings—every man and hired woman agreed to give one months wages, and such was the excitement among them, that one man, who owned a little home near the village, of six acres, the only one among them owning any real estate, ran and got the deed to his little property, and brought it to his minister, saying: "Here take this! I can work for more, only so that the church is built again." Of course the good man's land was not sold; but the Church was rebuilt and paid for, and I was at the dedication.

I know another case in Illinois, of a small English Lutheran congregation of fifty communicants, who, in four years, raised ten thousand dollars to support their minister and

build a house of worship, the finest in the town, without any foreign aid or going into debt, which is $2,500 a year, or at the rate of $50 a year to each member male and female. That is a new congregation, and was self-sustaining from the start, never asking or desiring missionary aid. And I know a number of individuals, in different parts of this western field, who give $200 and upwards to the support of their pastors annually, and do it cheerfully; and I mention these cases to show that some of our Lutherans know how to support the cause of Christ as well as other people.

Now let us inquire how this great work in the Northwest has been accomplished? And the answer is, mainly by the people themselves on the new territory. Some aid has indeed been obtained from the East and from Europe, but not more than one dollar to that of fifty raised on the ground. Many of the ministers, who have done and are doing the work here, were educated elsewhere; but the congregations were organized, the churches built, the pastors supported, and the Synods formed on the ground. It was indeed done by people who were largely members of the Church before they came to this country—by immigrants from the East, and from beyond the Atlantic—but by them and their descendants after they landed here. They found no organized congregations, houses of worship, institutions of learning, or gospel ordinances growing on the wild prairies. Like their farms, houses, towns, cities, railroads, and all the improvements of civilized society, so their churches, schools, colleges, and all religious institutions had to be built here. And who was to do it, but they themselves? And it is especially true of Lutherans, that they were largely left to themselves. Sometimes our eastern brethren have allowed themselves to think and say, that much had been done by the East for the West; but it is not true. Compared with what has actually been accomplished, it has been but as "a drop in the bucket." If we had depended upon the East, our Church in the West would have *died out*, instead of having, as now, 27 Synods and 400,000 communicants.

It has resulted from a deep conviction, among the people themselves of the absolute necessity and great importance of the work. We have indeed an element of society in the West, immigrants from Europe and various parts of our own land, "who left their country for their country's good," who want no religion and no churches—some of them call themselves Lutherans, and greatly scandalize us by the use of our name, who are satisfied only with the liberty of Sabbath desecration and the sensualism and drunkenness of the saloons. Of course such people have no God but their stomachs, and no religion but the gratification of their appetites and lusts. They are a kind of natural "brute beasts."

But look at the millions of immigrants, noble men and true, who do establish worship and build churches as soon as they settle upon our shores. They know and feel that man has a higher nature and spiritual wants which the religion of Christ alone can supply, and they immediately make provision for the supply of these wants. They understand well that society cannot hold together—that it would fall to pieces, and men become heathen in a free government without the powerful influence of Christianity to enlighten, sanctify, and save. Hence at any cost the Church and her institutions must be established and maintained every where.

From such a survey we may learn some lessons of great practical importance to which we should give heed.

1. *Give our people liberty to work in their own way.* To some extent yield even to their prejudices and peculiar notions. Let the Germans work as Germans, the Swedes and Norwegians as such, using their own languages, customs, and doctrinal peculiarities, only so that they have the pure word of God and "preach Christ crucified." Let them have their own synods, seminaries, schools and colleges, books and newspapers. They will soon see the necessity of an acquaintance with the language and ways of America, and will accommodate themselves to the state of things existing here. Let us not oppose them in these things, but help them by furnishing means to carry on their work, as far as in our power, and espe-

cially by preparing ministers to preach to them in English just as fast as they require it.

2. *In our work of Home Missions and Church Extension, let us learn the immense importance of developing the resources on the ground.* The first and most important question, in beginning a mission in a new place, is not, and never should be, how much can and will the Board give to sustain it?—but what are the *resources* on the ground?—what materials are there, and what can and will be done at the new place itself? The great and good men of our day and land, are not those whose fathers were rich and gave them plenty of money and a big start in the world—such usually have but little energy, and in a few years spend their money and fail. There is no stimulus to draw out what is in them. But young men who are thrown upon their own resources, with nothing but strong hands and resolute hearts, usually succeed and make their mark in the world. It is just so with churches. If a young congregation is made to depend largely on foreign aid, the members will not acquire self-reliance, and will not do what they ought to take care of themselves. There must be development at home, or the Church will never amount to much.

3. *It is clear that, as Lutherans we shall succeed best in our Home Mission and Church Extension work by being true to ourselves—to our doctrines, customs, and usages.* I do not mean bigoted and selfish, but honest, free, frank, upright Lutherans, full of faith, love, and good will to all—"with malice to none and charity for all"—not by trying to be like every body else, and, losing our character and ways, being like no body else, but simply holding fast to God's pure word of truth and our great Reformation doctrine of justification by faith, carefully instructing the young, and seeking to make men true and and honest Christians from principle, and not from mere impulse or fanaticism.

4. *We must become more aggressive in our movements.* Not merely looking after "the lost sheep" of our own Israel, but going into "all the world, and preaching the Gospel to every creature." We must go down to the people, even into "the

highways and hedges," and not wait for them to come up to us. The Gospel and the Church are intended for all men, and all will and must be made better by coming into the way of God's appointment. Wherever men are found, there we have a mission and a work. In God's Church we have the great and divinely appointed means for the enlightenment and salvation of the world. We need no other systems of reform and improvement for the human race. Push on, push on the Church!

5. *Let our Church fully understand that the future of our Zion in America is in the English language.* Ultimately this country will have but one language, as we can be but one nation. All foreign languages will gradually fall, more and more, into disuse, and when immigration ceases, as it must at last, they will die out. Hence our great business is to plant and maintain English missions everywhere, by the side of our German and Scandinavian churches, so that our people, and especially the young, as they become English, need not wander off into other folds to find pasture. We have been too slow to understand this, or to lay our plans deep and broad enough to meet the case. Scores and hundreds of our German ministers especially, from mere prejudice, passion, selfishness, or worse motives, have refused to introduce the English language, or to countenance it in any shape or form, when and where it was needed, and thus have driven their own people by multitudes into other denominations. This is both a sin and a shame for them, and we must not be afraid to tell them so. But this must stir up our English ministers and people only the more earnestly to come to the rescue. We must take in the whole field, not by opposing the use of other languages, as long as they are needed, but by putting the English within reach of all who desire it.

And now, in conclusion, must I not say that we should feel greatly encouraged by what is here before us? What a grand spectacle is not presented to us? In a little more than a quarter of a century, an entire new field is opened to our Church, and is occupied by it, to the number of some four hundred thousand communicants, with houses of worship,

pastors, schools, colleges, seminaries, and all the institutions and appliances of a permanent Christian civilization! Just suppose, for a moment, that all these vast multitudes had swarmed into this part of our common country, and recognized no God and Saviour, disowned Christianity, the Gospel and gospel institutions—had built no churches, called and supported no Christian ministers, established no Christian schools, and published no Christian books and papers! How fearful must have been the results! Thanks be to God for what we do see and know, as I have tried feebly to present it. What may we not expect in the next thirty years, if faithful to our trust! God help us. Amen.

ARTICLE III.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE GOSPEL MINISTRY.

By Rev. P. Born, Selinsgrove, Pa.

Plato says that education consists in giving to the body and the soul all the perfection of which they are susceptible. Kant, the great German philosopher, considers every man as having a divine ideal, the type after which he was created, the germs of a perfect person, and that it is the office of education to favor and direct the growth of these germs. But education, in its true sense, implies more than this. It aims, not only at a complete physical, intellectual, æsthetic, moral and religious development and culture of each individual, but also to put each generation, and, so far as possible, each individual, in possession of all the advantages and attainments of the preceding generations. In the individual, however, a complete development of all the faculties of the mind, and a perfect knowledge of all the acquisitions of former generations, is out of the question. Universal knowledge and skill, in the individual, are impossibilities. The multiplicity of activities, incident to civilized society, is too numerous, too various, too heterogeneous and too difficult to be pursued, much less proficiency attained in them

by the individual during the brief period allotted to man's stay on the earth. In view of this fact, the only rational course to be pursued by man is to select, from the numerous callings of this life, a particular one, and then to apply to its prosecution all the energies in his power. Life is too short and too precious to squander it on subjects, not at all, or only remotely connected with our calling. Had we time to master all subjects, we might rationally pursue a different course. On this point, we have the truth presented in the old song:

> "Could a man be secure
> That his life would endure
> As of old, for a thousand years,
> What things might he know!
> What deeds might he do!
> And all without hurry and care."

In considering the subject of ministerial education, or rather qualifications for the ministry, we should sharply discriminate between that which has real, and that which has only a relative value, in qualifying a man to discharge the functions of the ministry. We have never heard, nor read a plea, by an intelligent man, for an uneducated ministry; neither is it our purpose to present such a plea in this article, but we confess that we have, on more than one occasion, heard and read discussions on this subject, in which, a standard of ministerial qualfications was insisted on, that to us seemed to imply attainments so comprehensive, that it embraced in its broad sweep, not only theology and its cognate branches, but the whole encyclopædia of knowledge, science, art, philosophy, literature, history, and even the more remotely connected sciences, such as entomology, numismatology, and not even excluding a knowledge of astrology and necromancy—a standard, if it had been adopted and practically carried out, even in a much more circumscribed sense, would not only have *unministered* and set aside as unqualified the whole Synod in whose presence it was delivered, but the entire Christian ministry, even including the learned man who made the speech. Were such attainments essential, then might we indeed with great propriety exclaim, in the lan-

guage of the great apostle, not only in regard to the work of the ministry, but also in reference to the qualifications necessary, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

In insisting on a thoroughly educated ministry, we should ever bear in mind that there are some things, just as in all other callings, a knowledge of which is only of incidental or conventional value, and should therefore be carefully distinguished from those that are important, or essential. As a general thing, the knowledge essential to the proper and successful discharge of one calling in life, becomes merely incidental or contingent in that of another. A knowledge of agriculture, the mechanical and fine arts, which is essential respectively to the farmer, the artisan, the sculptor, and the painter, is only incidental to the preacher to qualify him for a proper discharge of his ministerial duties. A knowledge of these several activities may indeed be very desirable, and, in some respects highly conducive, under certain circumstances, to greater usefulness in the ministry, and may greatly augment the sources of the minister's enjoyments; but this kind of knowledge is not even important, much less essential, when compared with the value of that knowledge derived from other branches of study.

Again, as the knowledge of certain callings is only of a conventional value to the gospel minister, so there are other branches, a knowledge of which is indeed important to him, but by no means essential. Under this class, we place those branches, a knowledge of which is of more than incidental or conventional value, but of less consequence than the knowledge derived from those that have intrinsic or essential value. They occupy an intermediate position. They are neither incidental nor essential, but they are important. To these belong the subjects under the head of Natural Science, usually divided into Natural Philosophy and Chemistry. Also Mental and Moral Science, Rhetoric, Logic, History, the higher Mathematics, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, belong to this category. All of them, we grant, are important and, conse-

quently, a knowledge of them desirable, but that they are essential, in order to preach the Gospel, we do not admit.

That there is no absolute connection between a knowledge of these branches, and usefulness in the ministry, or that usefulness in the ministry does necessarily presuppose or imply a scientific or theoretical knowledge of these branches of study, is evident from the very nature of the case, or on *a priori* principles. They are not related as cause and effect; not even as antecedent and consequent. What intrinsic connection have the principles of Natural Philosophy, such as the laws that govern attraction, motion, mechanical power, the pressure of liquids and gases, sound, light, heat and electricity, with the duties of the ministry? Can any inseparable connection be pointed out between chemistry and what is essential in the ministry? Can no man preach the Gospel, and preach it in its purity and with power, unless he understands the theory of atoms, the laws, according to which they combine to form bodies? Must a man be acquainted with the laws of chemical affinity, the composition and changes of substances, ere he dare presume to enter a pulpit? So too with logic—which relatively is of greater importance to the minister than either Chemistry or Natural Philosophy—is a man unable to preach the Gospel, and to reason correctly of righteousness, temperance and judgment, without understanding the difference between inductive and deductive reasoning? Can he not perform the functions of the ministry, without knowing wherein an illicit process differs from an undistributed middle? A sophism from a fallacy? What constitutes a syllogism? What a figure? What a mood?

The same is true in regard to a theoretical knowledge of the principles of Rhetoric, Mathematics, Latin, Greek and Hebrew, all of them important, but none of them intrinsically essential to fit a man to preach the gospel. They are of great importance, but notwithstanding possess only a relative value.

When we look at this subject in the light of facts, or examine it inductively, we find our position overwhelmingly

and triumphantly sustained. What multitudes have labored most successfully in the ministry, who had the merest smattering of some of these sciences, and were entirely ignorant of others. What multitudes are yet laboring in the ministry with the broad seal of God's approbation resting upon their work, whose knowledge of these sciences is of the most limited character. Yet, in the face of all this, we often hear men, and good men too, whose much learning, in some respects, has made them mad, insist on a knowledge of these important branches as though they constituted a part of the essentials; giving as their principal reason for the position assumed that the age in which we live demands all this. There is a fallacy contained in this that is shallow and yet fraught with much mischief. Whenever men put forward those things that are only incidental or important in the ministry as essential, they substitute, it may be unconsciously, the weakness of human instrumentalities, for the power of God, as a means, to convert the world. What is still more evident, if possible, they cannot satisfy the demands of the age, with all their vast learning. In this, as well as in many other respects, every age seems to be a very perverse one, and inclined to cavil at the gospel, and carp at those who preach it, no matter what their attainments, and how learned and well qualified they may be to preach the gospel. Peter and John were certainly men of good parts, and very respectable attainments, yet, they were considered by the age in which they lived, and especially by those who were sticklers for routine, as ignorant and unlearned men. Yet, they understood their work and did it well. Paul, who unquestionably was no ordinary man in mental endowments, and literary and scientific attainments, was regarded by a certain class of learned and literary experts, as a mere babbler, notwithstanding he had delivered a speech in their presence which the very prince of Grecian orators never equaled. Christ, the Great Teacher, whose lips uttered knowledge and wisdom of the most exalted character, was regarded by many in the age in which He lived, as a mad man, as a demoniac, notwithstanding He spoke to His age as never man spoke to any age.

Perhaps if John and Peter, Paul and Christ, as well as many others since their day who caught their spirit, had mixed up with their teachings a little more philosophy falsely so called, and had laid more stress on finely spun and exquisitely polished rhetoric, and more intellectual culture, as well as insisted strenuously on certain set forms and ceremonies, the age in which they lived would not have considered them as unlearned and ignorant, mere babblers and mad men. What a pity that some of our modern intellectual wiseacres, sticklers for forms, sticklers for routine, could not have been there, to have given them an appropriate hint on the necessity of meeting the demands of the age in which they lived. How much more *respectable* they would have made the ministry of their day, and how much more good they might have accomplished had they only satisfied the demands of their age. But they failed. Their age did not appreciate them nor their doctrines. They were not learned enough.

If we now examine into what are the essentials in the Christian ministry, in order to qualify a man for that sphere of action, we shall find that the apostles, as well as all those who since their day have become distinguished in its ministry, possessed them in an eminent degree. As a matter of course, the first essential is genuine piety. To prosecute the work of the gospel ministry most successfully, the minister's piety dare not be of a questionable character. It must be deep, broad, fervent, and constant. Without depth of piety, he will lack in proper feeling and experience. Without breadth of piety, he will lack in liberality and Christian charity. Without fervent piety, he will lack in zeal and Christian activity; and without a piety that is constant, he will fail to produce in his life, in the highest perfection, the fruits of the the spirit; such as love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.

Such piety implies deep sympathy with suffering humanity, and a spirit of cheerful self-denial, qualities that fit a man to preach the gospel more successfully, and, consequently, are of more value to him than all the important branches

referred to combined. Piety, therefore, is the first essential, both in order and importance, and without which, a man can have no call to the work of the ministry, no matter what endowments by nature and attainments by study he may possess.

Joined with piety, there must also be a love for the work of the ministry—a love that will secure to its possessor in the discharge of his ministerial duties both their reward and a joy. This love for the work is essential both for the comfort and success of the ministry, but even joined with eminent piety, it is not sufficient.

Connected with these essentials, the minister must also have clear conceptions of the plan of salvation, To unfold and present this plan in all its beauty, fulness and adaptation to the wants of man is the great work of the Christian minister. To do this intelligently and successfully, the minister's own conceptions dare not lack in perspicuity. Consequently, he must have clear conceptions, settled views, and strong and decided convictions in regard to the truthfulness of the cardinal doctrines of our holy religion, especially on the subject of justification by faith—the article of a standing or a falling Church. This implies, as an essential, that he must have not culture, but a mind sufficiently disciplined so that he can take up and discuss intelligibly any subject, or any phase of a subject, legitimately connected with his calling, to the edification and profit of those to whom he ministers. A minister who, owing to a want of mental discipline, cannot do this, is certainly, from the very nature of the case, wanting in one of the essentials in preaching the gospel. A man who has not sufficient intellectual caliber and mental training to prepare his own sermons, but must resort to plagiarisms, to keep up appearances, lacks, not only an essential quality to fit him for his work, but is also dishonest, and consequently has made a grave mistake in the choice of his calling. For his own and his people's sake, he would much better, under such circumstances, stop short, and engage in some other avocation. What would we think of the man, who would set himself up for a surgical operator, and, yet did not under-

stand anatomy, or, if he had a theoretical knowledge of anatomy, but owing to a want of practical knowledge, had no skill as an operator, would we not stand amazed at the audacity of the man, and profoundly pity his patients? Should our amazement be less at the audacity of the man who would preach the gospel, the nature and relation of whose truths his undisciplined mind does not comprehend? Or should our sympathy for those to whom he professes to minister be less? But of the man who possesses the essentials which are contained in what St. Paul says, in 1 Tim. 3 : 1–7, we would unhesitatingly say that he is qualified to assume the sacred office of the ministry, even if he is as unacquainted with the sciences, and is as profoundly ignorant of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, as a Sioux, an Esquimaux, or a Hottentot?

Let no one infer from this, that we are unwilling to give due prominence to these very important branches, or that we seek to depreciate their value. We yield to no man in our regard and esteem for the relative value of the arts, the sciences, and the languages. Our aim is far, far, from discarding their use, or underrating their value. Our object is simply to place them where they of right belong—among the important, and, not as has often been done, among the essentials in ministerial education.

Neither do we wish to be understood as maintaining that a man may have the essentials without, in some measure at least, also possessing a knowledge of the incidental and important branches of study. This cannot be. The former necessarily imply or pre-suppose more or less of the latter. But, nevertheless, the latter are only of relative, the former of essential value. But possessing the essential, we would say to every minister, and candidate for the ministry, strive to master as many of the important branches of knowledge as possible, but see to it that you do not neglect to improve in the essentials also. If it is possible, let the minister, or candidate for the ministry, become a Bacon or a Newton in philosophy; in mental science a Locke, a Kant, or a Hamilton; a Kepler in mathematics; in chemistry a Davy, a Priestly or a Faraday; in church history a Mosheim or a

Neander; a Hume or a Gibbon in profane history; in philology a Max Müller, and in linguistic and scholarly attainments an Erasmus, a Michælis, or a Tischendorf; but, at the same time, let him not fail, in the essentials, to emulate a Baxter, a Doddridge, a Whitfield, an Arndt, a John, a Paul, yea, that he strive to be as his Master.

It must ever be borne in mind that making progressive advancement in knowledge, merely relative in value, to the neglect of that which is essential in the minister, will not avail to render him more useful as a preacher of the word. Nay, that such a course will even give a man a distaste and a certain unfitness for the faithful discharge of the duties of the ministry. That such has often been the case no one can doubt. That such is the natural and legitimate result of such a course is equally evident. A knowledge of anatomy, in some respects, might be of importance to a butcher, and an acquaintance with the science of mineralogy, might, under certain circumstances, be applied by the miner to some practical use, but were the butcher and the miner to pursue, the one the study of anatomy, and the other that of mineralogy, to the neglect of that which is essential to their success in their respective callings, the result would be, that just in proportion as they would become experts, the one in anatomy and the other in mineralogy, would they become unfitted to pursue, the one the business of a butcher, and the other that of a miner. It is not otherwise with the gospel minister. Men fail, or do not succeed in the ministry, not because they are unacquainted with the important branches of study, but simply because they do not possess and cultivate that which is essential.

In concluding this article, we desire to give a few extracts from an article on "Sources of Power in Preaching," written by one of the Editors of this Review—published in the same in 1872.

"If men appear in our churches, or are picked up in the sweep of the great revivals that break into the lowlands of the massess, who have a fire of conviction compelling them to testify of the grace of God, and who are capable of a simple

downright statement of the Christian verities, the Church has no call, though they may be of narrow range of knowledge and untrained reasoning powers, to put them aside, or insist on their taking a full course of education. Such men often have a wonderful power of piercing the indifference and defiance of the unbelieving masses: witness Richard Weaver, the butcher preacher of England, and that whole class of unlettered men who appear at the great races and fairs of England to preach, who tramp the lanes of the country, and thread the alleys of the cities, and are continuously winning multitudes to the truth. Perhaps every one who has much to do with the active ministry has come in contact with some such mind. 'Educate them,' say the sticklers for regular routine, 'and then let them preach.' No; many a man who has had force of conviction, and a native power of simple declaration of the truth, has been forever marred by an attempt to superinduce a higher culture. * * There is a class of minds that are only crippled by an attempt to equip them with much culture. They are Davids encumbered with Saul's armor; leave them to their sling and pebbles from the brook. Our Seminaries in New England, especially, have been sending out a class of young men of piety and devotion, but in whom piety has been like a little fire under a great heap of fuel, quenched and reduced only to smouldering and smoke. So alarming did this tendency become that, a few years ago, the accomplished Professor of Sacred Rhetoric at Andover, Dr. Phelps, felt constrained to address an earnest warning to his students to beware that their culture did not kill their ability to reach the popular heart."

ARTICLE IV.

THE ANNIHILATION THEORY BRIEFLY EXAMINED.

By Rev. D. M. Gilbert, A. M., Winchester, Va.

Those who pretend to deny upon the warrant of the Scriptures the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, are not very formidable antagonists of the truth, in point either of numbers or ability. They are found, however, scattered here and there, in almost every direction, throughout christendom, and, endeavoring to make up in zeal for their lack in knowledge and numbers, are industriously seeking to unsettle the minds of all who will give them a hearing, and sow in them the seeds of their somewhat plausible but very pestilent heresy. They are of that suspicious class of religionists the members of which, either ignorantly or perversely, ignoring the obvious distinction which exists between "the rule of faith" and "the faith of the rule," are loud in their expressions of contempt for all creeds, and proclaim the Bible their only confession of faith; but who do, of course, from the very necessities of the case, hold a creed, only the more objectionable because not formulated, concerning which they dogmatize with all the intolerance of the narrow minded bigot, and the fancied claims of which they intrude upon others with much of the offensive swagger of the fanatical partisan.

The notions of this school of theologastrians may be found pretty fully set forth in a book of some 300 pages, entitled "*Bible vs. Tradition.* By Aaron Ellis. Revised and much enlarged by Thomas Read." In the brief examination we here purpose making of the theory in question, we take this book as our chief guide, not because it is, by any means, the latest, nor yet the ablest, of the publications of this class; but simply because it has been specially brought to our notice and is at hand; because it has been, and is still, much lauded and

largely used by Annihilationists in the propagation of their views; and because, as far as we have been able to learn, it is, at least, a fair average specimen of the books put forth on behalf of the cause it so earnestly champions.

The author of this volume attempts to argue, or rather professes clearly to demonstrate, from the Scriptures, that there is no entity in the human being (call it "soul, spirit," or what you please) which can for a moment consciously survive the going forth of the last breath; that in the dissolution of the body the whole man, in all his parts, perishes as utterly as the brute: and that the only future existence for any child of man is that which shall be given to the believer at the resurrection. The book appears to deny (rather feebly and cautiously, however, for this is one of the points of serious difference amongst the advocates of the theory) the resurrection of the wicked: and, of course, scouts all idea of a future retribution for them as an idle invention. The everlasting punishment of the lost is simply *annihilation*, which comes upon them when the body is smitten by death; or, by the espousers of this general theory who accept the Bible's plain teachings concerning the resurrection of all men, it is held, that the wicked and unbelieving, as well as the righteous are, indeed, called in life from their graves at the last day; but only to be annihilated over again.

We have taught here, therefore, as may be seen at a glance, the grossest materialism. The doctrine, so far from receiving any countenance from the divine word, makes a confused and contradictory riddle of it, in more ways than we can delay to notice, and, without much pressing, as may more clearly appear further on, logically necessitates, on the part of him who holds it, a denial, not merely of the personality of the Holy Spirit, but of the existence of a personal God.

In looking through this book of Mr. Aaron Ellis, one is not long in reaching the conclusion, that an intelligent reader can hardly go very far into its pages without being moved, first of all, to ask himself a few general questions, something like the following:

Has not our author, perhaps, been led in some way, to

overestimate the value of his decisions as to the meaning of God's word? He introduces himself to his readers, in his opening chapter, by saying: "I have read the whole translation and the margin of the Old Testament eight times and the New Testament seven times; and have carefully examined every text on the soul, the state of the dead and the end of the wicked. From this examination I am thoroughly convinced that the whole man becomes unconscious in death. 'In that very day his thoughts perish.' Ps. 146: 4. 'Neither have they any more a reward,' until the resurrection, (!) and 'all the wicked will God destroy,' yea, He will exterminate both soul and body in Gehenna. (Eccl. 9: 5–6; Luke 14: 14). There is not a single text in the Old Testament that will not readily harmonize with these views, though there are a few texts in the New Testament from which inferences have been too hastily drawn, that would seem, to a superficial observer, to oppose these views." Did Mr. E. begin to weaken on the "inferences," that he did not give the New Testament the eighth reading as well as the Old? It may be worth remembering, when it comes to statements like this, that thousands of earnest and godly men have read the Bible many more than eight times, not merely in a translation, but in the languages in which it was originally written, patiently and prayerfully endeavoring to ascertain the mind of the Spirit, and have come to conclusions far different from these thus positively enunciated. It is hardly fair to assume that these thousands of devoted men, many of whom made the study of the text of God's holy word the one business of their lives, and have left a multitude of imperishable monuments of their learning and piety, were, after all, but "superficial observers," and that only Mr. Aaron Ellis and Mr. Thomas Read, and the few who agree with them, have been the careful, competent and successful students of revelation. If the settlement of the question at issue is to depend in any degree upon a preponderance of authority, it may be well to state, that it is a matter perfectly clear to Bible students in general throughout the world, and always has been, that the texts cited from the Old Testament, in the above quoted pas-

sages, do not furnish the slightest color of warrant for the conviction which they seem to have helped to produce in the mind of Mr. E., and that the text from the New Testament, which he pretends to give in paraphrase, rightly understood and interpreted, is altogether fatal to his "views."

That our author was not particularly modest, however, in his estimate of what he was doing in the writing of this book, nor moderate in his expectations as to what was to be accomplished by it, his pages give abundant evidence. As early as on the 78th page, he gives us to understand that he could well afford to stop and regard his position as impregnably established; but he keeps on through the many remaining pages because, as he says, "we wish to bury the immortal soul fable beneath such a burden of plain facts, that it will never have a resurrection." But assuredly there has been some miscalculation. That these high expectations have come to grief, and the labors stimulated by them, beyond the confusing and misleading, here and there, of an unwary reader, have proved futile, hardly calls for a demonstration. It is, perhaps, not unfair to infer from the failure, not by any means the first nor the last in this direction, that the "facts" are not quite so "plain," nor the arguments so weighty, as our annihilationist friends affect to regard them.

Again, has not Mr. E's. method of handling the subject he has undertaken to discuss, judging it in all charity, rather a decided smack of demagogism about it? For example, he says, on page 5, "Vain is the help of the learned in this matter," and again and again he may be found, either covertly or openly, sneering at learning and learned men; and yet he scarcely bends to the task he has set himself, before we find him on quite another tack, and it is discovered that the help of the learned is not so utterly vain after all. Having first sought to flatter and propitiate the illiterate, as it would seem, by sarcastic allusions to scholarship and boldly avowing that there is no necessity for it in an inquiry like that before him, he then trickishly shifts his position, and, by the display of a little sham profundity, attempts to impress his readers with the conviction, that he is no mean scholar himself, when the

occasion arises for showing it. Remembering that at the outset he has declared "vain is the help of the learned in this matter," mark how he changes ground. "If we wish to obtain the truth, we are of necessity driven to the Hebrew and Greek originals, [of the Scriptures] as the purest accessible fountains," p. 8. In another place, he gives certain facts, togther with some statements not facts, going to show the necessity for a thorough revision of our English Bible, and adds: "Still many will fondly cling to the common version, with all its errors and corruptions, and thereby help to conceal the precious truths which the providence of God has brought to light and placed within the reach of *the learned;* but which are shamefully withheld from the community," p. 10. Yet again he writes: "Assisted by *an honest and learned friend* of the Independent Congregational Society, we have traced all the original terms translated soul, spirit, life, breath, hell, grave and others, throughout the whole Bible, so that any person may readily perceive their Bible definitions," p. 11. Many more such passages might be cited, but these are enough. Of course, "we are driven to the Hebrew and Greek originals," if we would ascertain with fulness of accuracy the meaning of God's word. And, of course too, for the use of those originals linguistic learning is altogether indispensable. From our author's own statements on this one point then,—for which, however, he deserves no credit, as it is a point clear to the understanding of almost any child, —what are we to think of his sneers at learning and of his plain declaration "vain is the help of the learned in this matter?" Surely, not much that is very complimentary to Mr. E's. candor, or to the fairness of his methods in the management of a serious inquiry.

It may be remarked here, in passing, that the Christian world at large, has fully as much faith in the resurrection of the body, and looks forward with fully as much of joyful expectation to the final meeting with our coming Lord, when "He shall descend from heaven with a shout," as Mr. E. or any of his teachers or followers. He tells of no grander consummation of the believer's hopes in the morning of the resur-

rection than that for which we humbly wait. And, in view of that fact, we fail to understand wherein the superior "*preciousness*" of the doctrine he would teach consists. It may bring some poor consolation, for the present, to hardened sinners who would gladly compromise with God and the Bible on the extinction of their being at death; or it may serve to encourage and strengthen the impenitent in their rebellion against God; but we see little hope of other result as the natural and logical outcome of its acceptance. But, however that may be, if the doctrine is contained in the word of God, it is ours to accept and proclaim it, leaving all results with Him. The objections we make here to the teaching of Mr. Ellis are all included in this, that it is utterly unscriptural: nor do we regard it a thing difficult to show, that if his honest and learned friend of the Independent Congregational Society," was really both learned and honest, Mr. E. has availed himself of his assistance to very little purpose.

But further, does our author exhibit in the discussion in question a spirit and bearing becoming one who would treat of sacred things for the benefit of his fellow-men? Does he maintain in his pages the tone and temper of the earnest, conscientious, scholarly investigator, whose one aim is the bringing out of the truth? Look through his chapters. They are almost everywhere bristling with low, offensive impeachments of the character and motives of those with whose faith he is at variance, and, at every point at which contradiction is anticipated, he manifests an impatience and irritability, and a disposition to indulge in coarse but pointless denunciation, which, to say the least, argue rather badly for the strength of his own confidence in either the soundness of his logic or the correctness of his interpretations. The very title page, which bears the inscription "*The corruptions of Theologians detected*," indicates the spirit in which the whole work was written. And then mark such passages as these: "The Scriptures have been *purposely corrupted* to sustain the doctrine of the immortality of the soul," p. 10. "If any theologian *fearing that the craft is in danger by which he obtains his wealth*, should venture to deny the truth manifested in these

pages, he must likewise deny the truth of the Bible," p. 12. "If you are determined to *cleave to the loaves and the fishes, and the popularity of sectarianism*, we pray you, for consistency's sake, to abjure the name of Christian (?) and fight under your own proper colors," p. 43. "Those who can believe such glaring absurdities, can believe anything that *interested preachers*, or corrupted tradition, may please to impose upon them," p. 60. "The *devil and some preachers* agree in contradicting God," etc. "Every preacher, after having studied the subject, that still continues to preach the same dogma *for the sake of the loaves and fishes, and popularity, and resists the truth*, is giving currency to a lie that is sapping the foundations of Christianity," p. 64. And so on through the book *ad nauseam*. It is hardly worth while to press the question whether this is the spirit of the true inquirer after truth. Such elegancies of the volume before us as these, may be safely left to speak for themselves. One need but glance through these pages, so highly seasoned with them, to appreciate the truth of what a theologian of our own Church has written,* when he says: "Much of the materialism of our day is servile and dogmatic, implicit in credulity and insolent in assertion. Professing to be independent of names, and calling upon men to rally about the standard of absolute freedom from authority, it parades names where it has names to parade, and vilifies the fair fame of those whom it cannot force into acquiescence or silence. Claiming to be free from partisanship it is full of coarse intolerance. It is an inquisition with such tortures as the spirit of our age still leaves possible."

But there is yet one other general question, and that much more serious than any of the foregoing, which an intelligent reader, desiring to test the worth of the presentations made in the book before us, can scarcely fail to ask himself. It is this: Does not Mr. Ellis, so far from being anxious only to "manifest the true teaching of the Bible," as, with a loud flourish of trumpets, he so constantly professes, most shamelessly attempt to falsify and pervert both what men have

* Dr. Krauth's Introduction to Ulrici's Review of Strauss.

written and the Scriptures themselves, in the interest of the pernicious theory he has undertaken to maintain? It is no light matter to suggest such an inquiry. We do it, however, very deliberately, and, as we have no difficulty in showing, upon ample warrant. For example on p. 100, Mr. E. is not ashamed to write: "Luke 24 : 37, 'They supposed they had seen a spirit.' Verse 39, 'It is I: for a spirit hath not flesh and bone.' In this place Griesbach puts *phantasma* in the margin, which is doubtless the true reading." It must be somewhat astounding to an unsuspecting reader, who has been disposed to yield assent to Mr. Ellis's claim,—if not for himself for his materialistic friends and co-laborers,—of a monopoly of the learning and honesty in the world,—to find that just the opposite of the statement he here makes is the truth. The *facts* of the case are simply these. Griesbach puts nothing in the margin in this place. He states in his notes, on verse 37, that *one* manuscript, (D , *Codex Cantabrigiensis*, or Beza), of the seventh century, has "*phantasma ;*" but states it only to say, that it is to be rejected as an error. Nor does he give, in verse 39, any reading save *πνεῦμα*, (spirit) which, in both verses, is universally accepted as correct. And yet, that he may create the impression that there is some doubt or controversy as to the true text in this passage, Mr. Ellis misrepresents the plain facts, and makes Griesbach endorse what he explicitly and unhesitatingly rejects as beyond question an error. Again, on pp. 98, 99, Mr. E. says, with regard to Acts 7 : 59: "The grammar of the text charges the saying, 'Lord Jesus receive my spirit,' upon the wicked Jews, and afterwards records what Stephen did and said." As in the former case, precisely the contrary of this is true. "The grammar of the text," as any one may see at a glance who knows enough of Greek to enable him to distinguish between the singular and plural form of a word, makes it impossible, even if any good sense could be so obtained, to "charge the saying, 'Lord Jesus,' etc., on the wicked Jews." The word in the text for "they stoned," (*ἐλιθοβόλουν*) is, of course, plural, and describes the act of the Jews; whilst the

word for *invoking*, or "*calling upon God*," (ἐπικαλούμενον) is singular and relates only to Stephen.

Surely the "honest and learned friend of the Independent Congregational Society," must have had an engagement elsewhere when these and a multitude of other texts were treated by Mr. Ellis. If not, which, in these particular instances, is supposed to be the more conspicuous,—the learning or the honesty? There is a familiar maxim of the law,—*Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*,—of which some pertinent application to the matter in hand might, perhaps, be made here. Whether deliberately or ignorantly perverting the truth, in these and other places, Mr. E. and his book are alike shown by them to be utterly unreliable. In view of such exhibitions, our author's harsh, unqualified and oft repeated charges of corruption and dishonesty, made against translators, commentators and theologians generally, are only calculated to remind one of the stale trick of the fleeing rogue, who loudly cries "*stop thief*," in hope of diverting unpleasant scrutiny from himself and from the booty he would criminally appropriate.

But enough of these generalities. We should apologize for the disproportioned space allotted to preliminary matters of this character, were this book alone in our mind as we write. But we have regarded it worth while to indicate these points with some little particularity, because of the fact that they may be largely illustrated, not merely from the pages of Messrs. Ellis and Read, but from the writings of Annihilationists generally. The questions here suggested apply with more or less force to all the publications put forth in advocacy of the the theory under consideration. A large proportion of the champions of the cause are little more than mere servile copyists one of another. Storrs, Blain, Dobney, Ham, Hastings, Hudson, together with the authors of various anonymous publications, on both sides of the Atlantic, present, for the most part, a striking uniformity of substance, style and method, and all breathe very much the same spirit. *Ex uno disce omnes.* But few of them seem able to rise much above Mr. Ellis, in logic, exegesis, honesty of discussion, or

any other respect. That, however, is but what ought to be expected, perhaps, as part of the fruit of the theory wherever it becomes fairly rooted. A coarse, earthy, sensuous doctrine it would seem, judging from the nature of things, as well as from the writings of the mass of its representatives, to have an invariably coarsening, debasing effect upon the mind and manners of those who have no higher apprehensions of divine truth than faith in it renders possible. What Shakspeare writes, in "mournful numbers," is applicable here:

> "My nature is subdued
> To what it works in, like the dyer's hand."

In endeavoring to maintain that "man has no soul, nor spirit, that can exist as a living thing apart from the body," Mr. E. and the materialists of his school generally profess, as we have seen, to be simply presenting the plain teaching of God's holy word on the subject. When we come to examine their line of argument, however, we find them constantly, not only driven by the exigencies of their case into positions strangely, sometimes amusingly, illogical and inconsistent, but compelled throughout to violate the plainest laws of language as well as the simplest and most fully received principles of interpretation.* They treat the Bible as they would not dare to treat any other book in the world.

---

* It may be mentioned as a significant fact, that Mr. C. F. Hudson, the ablest advocate of the Annihilation theory in this country, appears to recognize the absurdity of many of the pretended arguments from the Scriptures, so greatly relied on by his friends, and is disposed in his discussions to lay greatest stress on considerations altogether outside of the Bible. In his chief work, "*Debt and Grace,*" by far the most respectable treatise, according to Dr. Bartlett, that has appeared on his side of the question, the argument from the Scriptures covers only 67 pages, although the pages of the volume number 470. And in a subsequent work, "*Christ our Life,*" published, as he says in the preface, "*to meet the convenience of those who rely, for their views of future life, upon the Scriptures,*" he says, also in the preface, that he "*doubts if any exclusively scriptural argument will prove satisfactory to many, however clearly it may appear to be made out.*" This is no trifling acknowledgment to come from the most scholarly of the teachers of this doctrine.

In his very lucid and satisfactory discussion of the subject, President Bartlett gives the key to the whole position and mode of argument of the Annihilationists in one sentence. "All the plausibility there is in the scriptural argument for annihilation," he writes, "consist of two main features; first, the constant restriction of the phrase 'eternal life,' with its opposite, 'death,' to denote simply continued existence and cessation of existence respectively, in violation alike of the common use and the clear scripture use of the words; and, secondly, the attempt to confine certain other expressions, setting forth the punitive anger of God in vivid and terrific material imagery, down to the lowest *sensual* aspect of those figurative expressions."* We find also, that a number of the advocates of this theory—notably Messrs. Ellis, Read and Blain—attempt, with no warrant whatever of rule or usage, but in opposition to both, to apply the same Procrustean process even to the terms "soul" and "spirit." They discover that the Hebrew and Greek words translated "spirit," have a primary meaning of "wind," or "breath;" and that the words translated "soul," sometimes mean simply "life," and sometimes, again, are used, as often in our ordinary speech, merely to designate a "person;" and, because of these primary meanings, and the occasional use of the words themselves, in the Scriptures, in their lower or primary sense, which no one has ever for a moment denied; they persistently assert that the Bible teaches the spirit to be only the breath, and the soul to be, at most, but the life of man. Indeed, Mr. Ellis says, that, according to the Scriptures, "the whole man is a soul and is *corporeal.*" That "a dead body is a dead soul, and a dead soul is a dead body; and that man's superiority to the brute "is derived from his superior organization." And to show the absurdity of any other view of the matter, he makes a great array of passages in which the term soul is used in a lower signification, and in words, evidently supposed to be very crushing, adds: "Thus, then, the fabled immortal souls

**Life and Death Eternal,* by Samuel C. Bartlett, D. D., President of Dartmouth College. Amer. Tract Soc. pp. 390. See p. 21.

can eat and drink, and have bones, and are slain with the sword!" And he really appears to mistake that sort of jugglery, the fallacy and sophistry of which may be detected at a glance, for argument. He never even seems to suspect that the tottering structure he seeks to build on that flimsy foundation must, under any fair test, go to the ground as a house of cards at the touch of a finger. It never appears to occur to him that by the same method, which must be just as allowable in one case as in another, if it is a right method, it is just as easy to prove that there is no God, save the gods of the heathen, (for the Hebrew word which is used to designate the one designates also the other), and that by this destructive treatment of language the Bible may be rendered altogether meaningless and valueless.

We have only to recall to mind the very plainest facts and simplest principles connected with the origin and use of words, have only, indeed, to "reflect for a moment upon the idioms that constantly flow from our own lips and run through the word of God," and the absurdly untenable character of the very stronghold of Annihilationism stands revealed. It cannot, of course, be successfully denied that in Hebrew and Greek, and in all languages, there are multitudes of words which are employed with a wide range of signification. At one time they are used in a narrower, more primary and literal sense, and at another in their larger, figurative, or what the lexicographers call their pregnant meaning; and the particular meaning to be attached to them, in our every day communications with each other and as we find them in the Scriptures, is, for the most part, readily determined by the connections in which they occur. Take as a simple illustration, somewhat analogous to "soul" and "spirit," as used in the Scriptures, the word "heart." We all know that it means primarily, as Dr. Dunglison briefly defines it, "the muscle which is the seat of life in animals and which by its contractions sends the blood over all parts of the body." So it is used in common speech, and so also it is used in the Scriptures, as, *e. g.*, where we read, that Joab thrust darts through the heart of Absalom, (2 Sam. 18 : 14). But whilst

we are familiar with the fact that this is the primary, literal meaning of the term, we are no less fully aware that it is used, just as frequently, perhaps, in ordinary speech, and almost universally in God's word, in its higher, figurative, or pregnant meaning. If an Annihilationist tells you of one habitually cruel, that he is a "heartless man," he does not, of course, wish you to understand him as meaning that the organ of physical life is missing from his anatomy. But to be consistent in his use of human language he ought to mean just that and nothing else. When he reads in the Scriptures, that Jacob "stole away Laban's heart," or of a "hard heart," a "proud heart," an "understanding heart," a "merry heart," a "sorrowing heart," a "broken heart," or that "every heart shall melt," he has no trouble in reaching right conclusions as to what is meant. When the wise man says, that "by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better," he does not understand him, as a physician, to be giving a prescription for the relief of heart disease. Or as he listens to the injunction, "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life," he hardly receives it as an admonition, to be very careful of that "muscle which is the seat of life in animals," if he would live long. And yet consistency, we repeat, in assigning terms their literal, primary sense, requires him to take these, and many other passages in which the word "heart" is used, in some such way. Annihilationists ought to find great trouble in all these places; and if unable, upon their own rule, to understand the mere physical organ of life in man as meant in them, they ought to either abandon the rule or throw away the Scriptures as a tissue of absurdities. And, indeed, the latter course offered in this alternative some of them openly threaten to adopt, if in the question of *fact* as to the meaning of "soul," "spirit," "life" and "death," in the Bible, the testimony of God in His word is really against their conceptions of what the fact ought to be.

That the divine testimony is overwhelmingly adverse to the theory in question, it is difficult to see how any intelligent readers of the Scriptures can fail to discover. Noth-

ing further in the way of illustration is necessary to show, that the rule of interpretation which the advocates of this figment of man's annihilation would lay down, and upon which they mainly rely, cannot be made general without making nonsense of the inspired word and utterly destroying its value. But can such a rule, with any better reason or truer and more consistent results, be applied to words and expressions connected with the one topic to which the annihilationists would restrict its use? Test it, however, slightly or exhaustively, by the utterances of inspiration, and how plainly and fully does it show itself, here as elsewhere, altogether fallacious and senseless. Grant, as every one does, that the word "soul" is used in the Scriptures, (as in Gen. 12 : 5) as signifying simply, *person*; or, elsewhere, (as in Ps. 8 : 5) with the meaning of *life*, in its narrower sense, our present physical existence; or, again, (as in Gen. 23 : 8, where the word translated "mind" is the Hebrew word for soul) merely in the sense of *desire* or *purpose:* is there anything in these or other uses of the words to preclude the possibility of its being employed, or to prove that it is not employed, in other places with a different and higher signification? Can any of the lower meanings of the term, *e. g.*, be forced into the familiar warning of Jesus, in Math. 10 : 28, without perverting its plain sense and evading the very point our Lord would make? That warning is, "*Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul:*" (or as Luke puts it, "after that have no more that they can do,") "*but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.*" Is not the word "soul" there obviously used to designate something in man distinct from the body, and the continuance of which in life is not dependent upon its connection with the body? "If the soul dies, or goes into oblivion, when the body dies, then he that kills the body would, with the same stroke, kill the soul too. But our Saviour tells us that those who kill the body cannot kill the soul. And if it be said that this is meant only of the utter destruction of the soul, God having promised a resurrection to life again," (Mr. Ellis and annihilationists generally endeavor to break the force

of the passage with the evident quibble), "then our Saviour might as well have denied that it is in the power of man to kill the body, because God certainly will raise it again at the last day. But our blessed Lord grants that the body may be killed by man, in the same sense wherein he denies that the soul can be; and therefore he is not speaking with reference to the resurrection at all. There is, then a life which the death of the body cannot touch."* Try this so called rule of interpretation, by which the annihilationist would support his theory, by this one utterance of our Lord alone, and you subject it to a crucial test under which neither the rule nor the theory can stand for a moment.

Nor does the unscripturalness of the system, and of the methods by which its friends would maintain it, appear less clearly when we turn to the term "spirit," as we find it employed in the Bible. Passing by the many absurdities of Mr. Ellis, and others of his school in this connection, grant, as every one does, that the words רוּחַ, and πνεῦμα, from πνέω to blow, have the primary meaning of *wind*, *air*, *breath*, and are frequently used in the Scriptures in that primary sense: is there anything in that fact to warrant the conclusion, reached and held by annihilationists, that therefore these terms are not, and could not be, employed by the sacred penmen in the higher sense which Bible readers generally understand them, in many passages, to convey? Our author says, indeed, that "spirit has numerous secondary meanings, such as intelligence, courage, the mind, the temper, the disposition," &c., but that "the expression 'deathless spirit" as applied to man, is a compound of Paganism, tradition and nonsense." He then cites passages, in which "spirit" is confessedly used in a lower signification, calls attention to the absurdity of endeavoring to substitute in such places the higher, and by an unceasing repetition of the transparent trick and a continual begging of the question at issue, in various ways, appears to think that he is clearly demonstrating his assumptions to be truths. He is like a fox, when the

*Lecture on the Apocalypse, by J. A. Seiss, D. D., vol. I., p. 357.

hounds are after him, again and again doubling upon his track, and resorting to every possible device to confuse his pursuers, throw them off the trail, and prevent them from running him to earth. But let any intelligent, fair-minded person, simply take up a concordance and examine the texts given under the head of "spirit," and it is scarcely possible that he can be deceived by the shifts and evasions and many unwarranted assertions of our author and his friends. If he finds the term employed in many cases in one or the other of its lower and more literal significations, so will he find it also, in many connections in which it is unmistakably used to convey the idea of the separate existence of the vital principle in man,—a something which, clearly, does not perish with the dissolution of the body. He will read from the wise man, (Eccles. 12 : 7), as he speaks of the time when "the silver cord shall be loosed"—"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was : and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." He will hear our Lord upon the cross, in the language of David, (Ps. 31 : 5), exclaiming with His last breath, "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit," (Luke 23 : 46). He will find similar words breaking from the lips of the first martyr of the Christian Church, as, sinking under the blows of his murderers, he prays, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit," (Acts 7 : 59). He will find our risen Lord quieting the alarm of His terrified disciples, who "supposed that they had seen a spirit," with the assurance, "handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." (Luke 24 : 36–39). He will read, "the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel or spirit: but the Pharisees confess both;" and that Paul proclaimed himself, as to the differences in doctrine between them, a Pharisee (Acts 33 : 6–9) and without going further, (for one plain text, on a point like this, harmonizing with the whole tenor and language of the word, is as good as a hundred,)—the candid reader will surely be led to more than suspect that there must be something fatally defective in the hermeneutics of annihilationists. And the first, natural suggestion of these texts to the mind of the reader is the correct one. No one can by any possibility, in any one of

them, fairly read into the term "spirit" simply *breath*, or any mere "principle which imparts and sustains life," but which with the last breath, is to go out into nothingness. All attempts in that direction have ended in signal and pitiable failure. Mr. Ellis seeks to meet the declaration in Eccles. 12 : 7, with the frequent but unfounded assertion, that if Solomon meant by "spirit" a living entity, in that place, he would flatly contradict himself, because in some other place he evidently means by the term only the breath. He then undertakes both to alter and to supplement the text, and says: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the *breath* or *spirit*, shall return to God who gave it; (as it was before it was given)." This may be a very convenient sort of argumentation; but whether it is satisfactory to intelligent people is a different question. It will be noticed, that Mr. E. first coolly assumes the very point to be proved, viz., that spirit and breath are equivalent and interchangeable terms, in the text in question; and secondly, takes the liberty of adding, parenthetically, to the statement of the wise man the words, "as it was before it was given," for which there is no warrant save the requirements of his theory. But notwithstanding all the efforts made by annihilationists, to pervert and obscure this text, it is really a very simple one and its import plain. It evidently recognizes the two-fold nature of man, body and spirit, the visible and invisible, and asserts of the one, that it shall return to the earth *as it was*, whilst the other, which is not from the earth nor of the earth, shall *return to God, not*, as in the case of the body, *as it was*, (for if it has acquired a moral character and is changed from what it was when originally given); but it goes out of this state of probation into one of retribution, (comp. Luke 16 : 22, 23) and is finally judged of God according to its condition and desert, (verse 14). In what sense does the *breath*, or the air we breathe, according to the theory in question go to God? Is it meant simply that it goes into the hands, or where it is subject to the power of Him, who "holds the winds in His fists?" That is not any more true of the breath than it is of

the dust, which returns to the earth, and by every such pretended interpretation the significant distinction which Solomon makes between the body and the spirit is altogether ignored. The manner in which Mr. E. would dispose of the other passages cited (except Acts 23 : 6–9, which he and the writers of his school generally appear not to have noticed) is really beneath criticism. We have seen, on a former page, how, in one or two of them, he would, if possible, eliminate the term "spirit" (πνεῦμα) altogether. And, apart from the embarrassment of being asked to explain, why any one, as in the case of Stephen, should so earnestly commend to God in prayer the last portion of the air he breathed, or a something which, at best, either is, or is about to become, a nonentity,—the number of passages is quite large in which, for various reasons, it would be a great relief to annihilationists to have, not merely the term, but the context which makes it significant, expunged.

As to the expressions "eternal life" and "death," it is simply astounding how any one, having even the most limited acquaintance with the general history and laws of human speech, can look through the passages of Scripture, in which they occur and conceive himself warranted, by either reason or revelation, in an attempt to restrict their meaning to simply "continued existence and cessation of existence respectively." Dr. Bartlett's argument on that general topic is as clear and conclusive as could well be desired. He shows that "death" does not even "*literally* and in its lowest use signify extinction of being, nor 'life' simply its continuance:" that the primary meaning of the word, as given in the dictionaries, "turns not on the extinction of being, but on the *cessation of certain functions;*" and that in harmony with this is the scriptural use of the word even as applied to things inanimate. "'Thou fool! that which thou sowest is not quickened except *it die*,' (1 Cor. 15 : 26). 'Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground *and die*, it abideth alone, but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit,' (John 12 : 24). Is a grain of wheat annihilated in order to germinate? or is there merely a change of condition and mode of action, whilst its existence and

properties remain?"* He then directs attention to the higher or pregnant sense of the words "life," and "death," as used every day amongst us, and in all times and amongst all peoples, (examples will readily occur to every mind) and shows how in the Scriptures the terms are used similarly, though in a still higher or more pregnant sense, because man is therein addressed, "not simply as a being, made to act, think, or receive pleasure, but as a moral accountable being, made to 'fear God and keep His commandments,' and thus to live in holy and intimate union with his Maker."

"*That Spiritual state in which man is living in intimate union with God, performing the true work of life, and reaping the blessed fruits*, in which all the functions of his being are harmoniously and happily accomplished, the Scriptures abundantly and constantly name "life;" and its opposite condition they term "death." The words describe the *spiritual condition* of the man in this world, and still more emphatically its completed results in another world." * * * * "Nothing but "life" in its most pregnant meaning can express the divine idea of the work that goes on forever in the regenerate heart."

"Death," on the other hand, is that state of separation from God, and from the beatific fruition of God, in which all the higher faculties of human nature are working falsely and discordantly; in which the true end of living is discarded and its true enjoyment lost; and in which there is at last the complete extinction, not of the soul's being, but of its well-being. It sums up the whole penalty of sin; the complex woe, beginning here, matured and perfected hereafter."

* * * "This use of the terms is a fact which no sophistry can evade." * * * "The origin of this mode of speech is not difficult to decide upon. While physical death, as the most terrible of natural events, would be a ready symbol for the most fearful woes to the spirit, (so *light* and *darkness* are naturally and almost inseparably associated with the idea of spiritual illumination and its opposite) we believe the actual connection to be historic, originating in the record of

* "Life and Death Eternal," pp. 38, 39.

the fall and the curse: "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die" That this included physical death, the Scriptures leave no room to doubt; nor may we reasonably doubt that at once there passed upon the frame the mysterious change which was to bring it surely to the dust. But that this was not all the curse, nor its most immediate and perceptible effect, nor the chief stress of its terror, lies on the face of the record, and is found in God's own unfolding of the sentence."

"What was the immediate result of the transgression? The sense of guilt and shame,—'They saw that they were naked;' severance from God, terror, and recoiling from His presence, with total loss of the joys of intercourse with Him,—'I heard thy voice in the garden and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself.' Then comes a further unfolding in the sentence which announced to the woman pain and sorrow and subjection, and to the man sorrow and wearisome discouraging toil, till thou return unto the ground.' The simple returning to dust, then by the record's own showing, was not the whole penalty involved in the threat, 'Thou shalt surely die:' it was only an outward token and seal of a comprehensive woe, the broad and fearful consequence of sin."

* * * * * * *

"The assertion of some that to 'die,' in the threat involved merely physical decease, is met by the insurmountable fact, that the actual consequences, as set forth in the record, and subsequently announced by God himself, include a great deal more. The simple facts of that momentous transaction at the beginning of human history are these: First, the command, with the annexed penalty in one word, 'Thou shalt surely *die;*' next the transgression; then the consequence, not alone an ultimate return to dust, but also an *immediate* severance from God and His fellowship, shame, remorse, dread, and terror before God, sorrow, painful labor, and a curse on the very conditions of toil. Now what more natural and almost unavoidable than that, thenceforth, the state into which man fell, with all its complex and on-reaching woe, should be described by that one term "death?" Indeed, so thoroughly

does this higher and pregnant meaning of the term often predominate, that, in repeated instances, the physical decease is overlooked as not properly deserving the name. Thus the Saviour says (John 8 : 51). 'If a man keep my saying, he shall *never see death.*' "*

These paragraphs, although losing some of their force, in being thus severed from the argument of which they form a part, will serve to bring before our minds clearly the sense in which the Christian world at large, from the days of the apostles until now, have understood the terms "life" and "death" to be largely used in the Scriptures. They also present some little part of the irrefutable reasons for our so holding. Let any one take the substance of them into his mind along with the substance and rule of the Annihilation theory, as expounded no matter by which of its advocates, as he looks into the Bible for passages treating of "life" and "death;" and which view of the teaching of the Scriptures will really appeal to the mind as the more satisfactory and the better founded in common reason and in holy writ? Does the narrow rule which the Annihilationist would apply, he cannot tell why, only to such terms as have a connection with the general theory he would maintain, satisfactorily interpret such passages of the word as represent certain men as being, here and now, in a condition called "death?" Does it seem applicable to others in which men are described as passing, in this world, by the exercise of faith, "*from death unto life?*" Does it encounter no embarrassment in such a declaration, "This my son was *dead* and is alive again; he was lost and is found," (Luke 15 : 24, 32)? Or in such as, "She that liveth in pleasure, *is dead while she liveth*," (1 Tim. 5 : 6)? Or in "You hath he quickened who were *dead* in trespasses and sins," etc., (Eph. 2 : 1–6)? Or in Rev. 3 : 1; Col. 2 : 13; Col. 3 : 3; Rom. 6 : 1–11; John 5 : 24; 1 John 3 : 14, 15; John 6 : 47 *et seq.* 17 : 3; Gal. 2 : 19, 20; Eph. 5 : 14, and other places too numerous to be cited? There is scarcely one of them, nor yet of others, in which occur such expressions as

* "Life and Death Eternal," p. 44, et seq.

lost, perish, consumed, cut off, destroyed, slain, etc., where an attempt to apply rigidly the annihilationist's chief rule of exegesis is much less than a mockery of God's word and of the common sense of mankind. Why should any one thus refuse to regard all "the deeper significance" of the Scriptures and "take nothing but the husks?" Why thus endeavor to "materialize human speech, or rather take away the life and leave only the carcass?" We can find but one answer. A theory scripturally false can find nothing in the way of plausible argument for its support in the divine word save by the use of false methods; and those who have become deeply enamored of a false theory and, under the fearfully blinding power of prejudice and error, are persistently bent upon holding it fast, are seldom amenable in any great degree to calm reason, nor are they prone to stickle much at methods.

The weakness of the general position and mode of argument of the advocates of the system in question, become especially apparent when we come to examine, with any care, the particular texts which constitute their chief reliance in the promulgation of their views. We find, first of all, that with a proneness for reversing the natural and proper order of things, which seems to be characteristic of them, annihilationists would make the Old Testament the key to the New. Instead of turning the clearer light of the New Testament back over the Old, for the illumination of its utterances, they are continually attempting to project the shadows of the latter over the plainest utterances of the former. The mass of their so-called proof texts, therefore, are from the Old Testament. We cite a few of those which seem to be regarded as specially conclusive.

Ps. 146 : 4: "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to the earth; *in that very day his thoughts perish.*" The point supposed to be made here, of course, is, that there can be nothing of consciousness for one after his decease, if in that day "*his thoughts perish.*" It is enough to say that the word here rendered *thoughts*, means also *counsels*, or *purposes*, a sense which the context evidently requires. The psalmist in utter

ing a warning against putting trust in princes, because death would summarily end their plans or purposes for their own welfare or that of others, is very far from asserting, that in the day of the going forth of their breath their consciousness and power of thinking would be destroyed. In Isaiah 55 : 9, "Let the unrighteous man forsake his *thoughts*," are we to suppose that the unrighteous man is exhorted to cease thinking? The brief note of Alexander on Ps. 146 : 4 gives fully and accurately the sense of the whole verse. He says: "The primary idea of *breath* and the secondary one of *spirit* run into each other in the usage of the Hebrew word (רוּחַ), so that either may be expressed in the translation, without entirely excluding the other. '*His thoughts*,' his vain notions or ambitious schemes." Without doubt death is continually bringing to naught the vain notions and ambitious schemes of men; but there is clearly nothing like the extinction of man's being necessarily involved in any thing connected with that familiar fact.

Eccles. 9 : 5: "For the living know that they shall die: but *the dead know not any thing*, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten." In their treatment of certain passages of this general class annihilationists are constantly forgetting, that "he who proves too much proves nothing;" and so it happens, that the very texts which they cite with greatest confidence in support of their theory in one of its parts, by a consistent application of their own rules to them throughout, are found to be altogether irreconcilable with it in another. In the passage before us, *e. g.*, what is said of the dead is said of *all* the dead, without distinction or qualification; and the same sentence which tells us that they "*know not any thing*," assures us no less plainly that "*neither have they any more a reward.*" The one assertion is just as emphatic and unmistakable as the other. The literal mode of interpretation which the annihilationist would apply to the former, he is bound to apply also to the latter; and thus, in spite of himself, he has but this alternative, either to give up his rule altogether, or become under the declaration of the text, a thorough and consistent Sadducee

and deny the doctrine of the resurrection and a future life *in toto.* In Eccles. 3 : 19–21, to say nothing here of other similar passages, he is reduced to precisely the same strait. He will not maintain unqualifiedly that "a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast," in the face of his own creed's teaching concerning the ressurrection.

In short, the great blunder of the advocates of the theory in question as regards the mass of such passages,—taking it for granted that they sincerely desire to reach right conclusions as to the meaning of God's word,—consists simply in this, that they fail to note the fact, often clearly indicated by the context, that the authors of these passages are contemplating the condition of things at and after death, merely as it appears to the eye of sense and as viewed from the standpoint of man's relations to this world alone. That the language in Eccles. 9 : 5, *e. g.*, is intended to be so understood, plainly appears from the very next verse which says of the dead, "neither have they any more a portion forever *in any thing that is done under the sun.*" It has been truly written, therefore, that it is vain for the annihilationist "to appeal to those passages which speak of death as the land of silence and darkness; for these passages are quite as often employed in case of the righteous as of the wicked, and they manifestly describe the case merely according to the *appearance* of things. It is the view from this side, the land of the living. To us it is darkness and silence, where there is 'no work nor device.'"* And Mr. Hudson, to whom we have already referred, as the ablest advocate of the annihilation theory in the country, does not dissent from this. He says: "The argument to prove unconsciousness is often based on the expressions 'the dead know not any thing;' their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished, and 'there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest,' (Eccles. 9 : 5, 6, 10). But these expressions are evidently (verses 2, 4) the conclusion of an Epicurean argument, including the denial of all future life, which the

* "Life and Death Eternal," p. 103.

'Preacher' has taken up. And when Hezekiah says: 'The dead cannot praise Thee,' (Isa. 38 : 18), the language is rather that of despair respecting *any future life*, (verse 11). The same may be said of the expressions in Job 3 : 11, 16; 14 : 10, 14; Ps. 6 : 5; 30 : 9; 88 : 10, 12; 115 : 17; with which compare 1 Cor. 15 : 18, where the argument evidently shows that those who are fallen asleep in Christ are *not* perished, since Christ has risen."* Mr. H. thinks himself capable of establishing the theory on altogether different grounds. In his concessions with regard to such passages as these, however, he is giving away the chief stock in trade of the mass of his fellow advocates of the annihilation notion, for which they will not be likely to thank him very heartily.

In the writings of the class of materialists to which Messrs. Ellis and Read belong we find also a constant citation of the threatened penalty for disobedience to God's command, Gen. 2 : 17, "Thou shalt surely *die*," and Ezek. 18 : 4, 20, "The *soul* that sinneth it shall *die*." It is enough to say here, that in connection with the former of these texts it is usually found convenient to omit the first part of the sentence,—*In the day that thou eatest thereof;*" in connection with the latter equally convenient to pay no attention to the statement of verses 21, 28, that if the wicked will turn from his sins, "he shall surely live, *he shall not die;*" whilst in both places, as has been sufficiently shown, they most unwarrantably assume their own definition of death to be undeniably correct. In their expositions of the divine word they proceed somewhat after the manner of the interpreters of the will in Dean Swift's famous Tale of a Tub. They wanted to construe the will, not according to what it really set forth, but so that it might meet the measure of their own wishes. The text not answering their purpose as it stood, they took sentences; but sentences not yielding the desired meaning, they took words; they could not find the right consecutive words, so they fell back upon the syllables, and finally finding

* "Debt and Grace," p. 262.

they would not do, they selected letters, and putting them together made it just such a will as they wanted. Upon the same general principle, by the mangling of passages and the chopping up of texts, annihilationists draw something in the semblance of argument for their theory from the Scriptures; but it will be scarcely more apt, one would think, to impose upon intelligent readers of the Bible than would the sort of interpretation of a legal document described in the witty Dean's story upon twelve sensible men in a jury box.

Turning to the New Testament we find a few texts much used by annihilationists, from which they seek to draw inferences, very conclusive they seem to suppose, as to the truth of their system; but they are really less happy, if anything, in their attempts with these than with the texts to which attention has just been directed. We note the following specimens:

1 Tim. 6 : 15, 16, "The King of kings and Lord of lords; *who only hath immortality*," If, say our materialistic friends, God only hath immortality, as the apostle here declares, how can you affirm from the Scriptures that man is in any sense, or in any part, immortal? There is no real difficulty presented in such a question. The word immortality is used in different senses by the apostle. "That is immortal which either can be destroyed by absolutely no power, not even by divine power (and in this manner God alone is immortal), or which has been so framed by God as not to perish, although by God's absolute power it could be destroyed; in the latter manner the souls of men and the angels are immortal."* The apostle evidently has in mind and is speaking of the *essential, self-derived* immortality of God,—His being "*without beginning of days*, nor end of life,"—in the passage in question; in which sense, of course, no one would claim such an attribute for any creature. If St. Paul uses the term only in the sense of the annihilationist, what are we to say, not to mention other cases, of Enoch and Elijah? How are we to reconcile the declaration to Timothy that God only hath immortality with the equally solemn and authoritative assurance to the

* See "Schmid's Doctrinal Theology," p. 648.

Hebrews (11 : 5), that "Enoch was translated that he *should not see death?*" From this consideration alone it becomes evident, that, in 1 Tim. 6 : 16, immortality, (ἀθανασίαν) is employed with a specific signification and not in the general sense in which we use the word as expressing simply the ceaseless continuance in conscious being of man's soul.

But, again, it is urged that, according to the Scriptures, immortality is to be sought after, and is therefore, *not a possession, but a something the attainment of which is purely conditional.* The position is based on Rom. 2 : 7, where the apostle says, that God will at the judgment render to every man according to his deeds, and will give to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, honor and *immortality*, eternal life." Here it is to be noted that the word for immortality, in the original, is not ἀθανασίαν, but ἀφθαρσίαν. In the former term *deathlessness* appears to be the sole idea, in the latter it is rather *incorruptibility*,—exemption from the power or influence of that which is vitiating or pernicious, and so subversive of one's well being. The one speaks simply of an endless, indestructible life; the other, of such a life in the blissful freedom from evil, or complete deliverance from corruption, which upon certain conditions shall be inseparable from it. If this philological distinction be well grounded, the annihilationist, of course, has nothing whatever to stand upon here. Nor is his case one whit better if we put aside that distinction, and, regarding the two words translated immortality as altogether synonymous, consider the manner in which they are used in the Scriptures. The term of the passage before us is employed in 1 Cor. 9 : 25, to express the idea that *the crown* which the believer shall receive at the last day is *incorruptible;* in 1 Pet. 1 : 4, 23, it is applied to *the inheritance* to which the believer is begotten by the grace of God; and again, in 1 Peter 3 : 4, to *the regenerated nature of man in this world*,—in each of which places, however, the annihilationist, in the following of his own chosen rules and methods of interpretation, must take issue with the inspired writers and deny the propriety of the application of the word. For if immortality, or incorruptibility, means

only, and in every instance, an unceasing continuance of conscious being, and if God only hath this immortality, how can it be said that *the crown*, the *inheritance*, and "the meek and quiet *spirit*" of the believer have anything of immortality or incorruptibility? The first two, according to his theory, are altogether material and inanimate, and the last at the believer's death must become extinct. Into just such absurd contradictions and inextricable entanglements is this narrow, unscriptural notion of what has been revealed of the nature and destiny of man, at every step, leading its advocates; and if they attempt at any point to modify their definition, they yield the whole question. With regard to the text before us we would simply say then, with Lange,—"*Δοξα, τιμή, αφθαρσια,* (glory, honor, immortality or incorruptibility) are *the phases of the manifestation of the ζωή αίωνιος* (*eternal life*) for those who from afar have been striving for salvation." Or we may say, with Bloomfield, that the words *καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν* are added to explain, or qualify, *δοξαν,* and "to raise the description far beyond whatever this world can furnish." As equivalent, therefore, with the incorruptible crown of life, or the everlasting inheritance, the future state of glory, honor and incorruptibility of which Paul here speaks, is, indeed, conditional,—a something which we are encouraged and exhorted to seek through faith in Christ and a persevering continuance in well doing,—but it is something very different from mere *existence*, in itself considered, of which modern materialists prate.

Further appeal is made to 2 Tim. 1 : 10, by some of the supporters of the theory in question, and the argument they attempt to base upon it is, that the doctrine of the soul's immortality must be altogether false because it is was held and taught by heathen philosophers long prior to the advent of Christ, whilst the apostle here assures us that "life and immortality were brought to light" only by Christ through the gospel. It is somewhat amusing to examine the confused and conflicting statements of annihilationists as regards what was believed and taught on this general subject, among the nations, before the Christian era. Messrs. Storrs and Dobney,

e. g., in the following of Archbishop Whately, utterly deny that there was anything like a general belief in the immortality of the soul among the heathen nations, whilst Messrs. Ellis, Read, Ham and others, just as stoutly maintain the contrary opinion. Dr. Whately says: "The doctrine of the soul's immortality was not known to the heathen, since if it was known to them *the New Testament does not reveal it.*" Mr. Balfour says: "The doctrine was a popular belief among the heathen, and *therefore the New Testament does not reveal it.*" As we have just said Mr. Ellis adopts the latter argument, with the view on which it rests, and asserts that "the pagans originated the idea of the immortality of the soul," and that "Christians have adopted the fable and inserted it into their creeds."

It is to be noted, first, that much of what is said by annihilationists on the passage before us proceeds upon the ignorant assumption that there is nothing of *gospel* save that which has been revealed in the New Testament Scriptures. The truth of course is that there is not a little of *gospel* to be found in the Old Testament, just as there is much of *law* in the New. Paul tells us (Gal. 3 : 8), of a preaching of "*the Gospel unto Abraham.*" And in writing of the Jews who perished in the wilderness he expressly declares: unto us was the Gospel preached *as well as unto them.*" The first gospel, or *proto-evangelium*, as it has been called, is given in Gen. 3 : 15, at the very beginning of the history of our race. So the apostle writes in Titus 1 : 2, that God had promised eternal life "before the world began," *i. e.* in the earliest ages.* The prevalent belief therefore in a future life, as found existing to some extent in all times and amongst all nations and tribes, is to be attributed originally to the divine revelations given of God to the human race and handed down from generation to generation by tradition. There is a very broad distinction, it might be well to observe, between *originating* and merely *entertaining* and *transmitting* a particular idea. And it is not so very wonderful, that an originally God-given idea, especially when we find so much in the universal con-

*See Bengel, Alford and Lange, *in loco.*

sciousness of the race which seems calculated of itself both to suggest and confirm it—should be found held in some form or other amongst people who for many generations have been utter pagans.

But the pagan notions of immortality, as we know, and even the beliefs of God's ancient people on that subject, were often exceedingly vague, obscure and indefinite. The gospel truth, originally proclaimed to our first parents after the fall became wholly perverted or obliterated by sin, sensuality and materialism among the nations at large. So that, in the general sense, even in which we use the term immortality as expressing the idea of an uninterrupted continuance of being, but especially in the particular meaning of the phrase "life and immortality," the incorruptible, undefiled and unfading inheritance of the believer in the future state, which the apostle has in mind here, it may be well said, that "the grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, is now made manifest, (or rendered clear), by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath *abolished death* and brought *life and immortality to light* through the gospel." Bloomfield says justly upon φωτίσαντος, "Render, 'who hath illustrated,' and, by implication, made certain, what was before obscure and dubious, just as bringing light to any object ascertains it reality." And Scott correctly writes: "Whatever notions and convictions any of the Gentiles had concerning the soul's immortality, they knew nothing of the way in which eternal life might be enjoyed by sinful man: they were wholly ignorant of the meaning annexed in the Scripture to the words 'life and immortality.' Their speculations served only for amusement or disputation, being blended with error and fable, involved in obscurity and uncertainty, and utterly inefficacious on their practice. The Jews, indeed, had a revelation in the Old Testament, both of a future state and of a resurrection of the body. But it was far less full and explicit than that in the New Testament, it was chiefly confined to one small nation: and it was very imperfectly understood and believed, even in that one nation, (Math. 22: 23–33). So that whatever had been conjectured or believed,

before the coming of Christ, concerning a future state, it might properly be said, that 'He had brought life and immortality to light by the gospel:' the doctrine respecting it was placed in the most convincing and interesting light; every proper question about it was satisfactorily resolved; and the whole was suited to answer the most important practical purposes." Without going into further detail, therefore, it sufficiently appears, that, in what the annihilationist has to present on such passages as these, instead of sound, scriptural argument, we find only what Dr. Bartlett would call "a poor juggle."*

But, once more, the narrow, materialistic theory we have been examining, so far from being sustained by specific declarations of the divine oracles, is everywhere in irreconcilable conflict with their very plainest and most important teachings. Attempt to carry it with you, as the very truth of God, in your reading of the word, and, instead of harmony, you find it bringing in absurdity, confusion, chaos. In their efforts to bring about an agreement between its plain implications and the utterances of inspiration, what are its advocates compelled to teach, *e. g.*, concerning God? From a mass of similar matter in the book before us, we cite the following: "Spirit is sometimes thought to refer to God himself, John 4 : 24, *Pneuma ho Theos;* 'the God [is] spirit.' But in the preceding verse, spirit is used as opposed to outward worship; and it appears to be used in the same sense in this verse. We might therefore understand these verses thus: 'The true worshipper shall worship the Father not with outward observances, in particular places, as at Jerusalem in preference to Mt. Gerizim; but with their minds and hearts; for God is an intelligent being and they that worship him must worship with intelligence and sincerity. In Ps. 139 : 7, 'Whither shall I fly from thy spirit'? It is in heaven, it is in *sheol*, (the grave) and it is in the uttermost part of the sea. It pervades all things, is the second cause of all motion

*For a full array and searching discussion of the texts and arguments for Annihilationism, consult "*The Immortality of the Soul and Final Condition of the Wicked,*" by Robert W. Landis.

whether in the planets, the tides, the lightnings of heaven, or in the breathing things that God has made. It may have been this *ruah Elohim* (*Sic!*) that 'brooded upon the face of the waters;' Gen. 1 : 2. It is not necessarily implied here that the *ruah* was a personal being; but that God's intelligence was everywhere. Therefore we infer that the nature of God is not clearly determined by any of these expressions," pp. 85, 86. Without pausing to say anything of the confused nonsense of this oracular deliverance, we simply cite the passage and place by its side these two or three sentences of Dr. Buchanan: "It is no doubt competent, and it may even be highly useful to entertain the question, how far the theory of materialism should be held to affect the grounds on which we believe in a living, personal, spiritual God? In answer to this question, we have no hesitation in avowing our conviction, that the theory of materialism, however it may be modified, has a tendency to impair the evidence of that fundamental article of faith. God is 'a Spirit,' and man was made 'in the image of God.' Take away all spiritual essences; reduce every known object in nature to matter, gross or refined; let mental and moral phenomena be blended with the physical, and what remains to constitute the ground-work of a spiritual system, or to conduct us to the recognition of a supreme, immaterial mind? If the material body, with its peculiar organization, be capable of producing human thought, and sufficient to account for the intelligence of man, why may not the material universe, with its mysterious laws and manifold forces, be held sufficient to explain whatever marks of a higher intelligence may appear in Nature? and why may we not at once embrace Pantheism, and conceive of God only as 'the soul of the world?' "* How can Mr. Ellis, and his friends and followers, honestly, and consistently with their own interpretations as given to the world, meet this issue and deny the Pantheistic character of their creed?

How, as another illustration, does this purely materialistic

* "Modern Atheism," by James Buchanan, D. D., LL. D., pp. 241, 242.

theory harmonize with what the Scriptures teach concerning sin? If man's superiority to the brute is derived merely from his superior physical organization, as Mr. Ellis says, what is there in him, any more than in a brute, to which anything like moral accountability can attach? As an accurate reasoner has well said: "I cannot be the mere outcome of natural law, and yet accountable for the fact that I am no better than I am. If I am only the child of nature, I must be entitled to the privileges of nature. If I have come from matter alone, then I cannot dwell within the shadow of a responsibility whose birthplace is elsewhere—in a different region altogether." * * * "A man who is nothing more than an aggregate of natural powers, can have no true vision transcending the range of these powers. The Unseen, or a law coming forth from the Unseen to rule his spirit, must be a mere superstition to him, and sin, as the violation of such a law, a mere gloomy phantom, to be got rid of the best way he can."*

And so, as regards regeneration, and other important doctrines of the word which need not now be enumerated, a consistent maintenance of the annihilation theory brings one into direct and unceasing antagonism with many of the very plainest and most important directions and implications of the one, only rule of faith and life which God hath given us.

But how different is the case, on the other hand, when we come to examine that which the Christian world at large accepts and proclaims as the divine teaching concerning the nature and destiny of man! Here everything is natural, unstrained, consistent, harmonious, whether the doctrine be considered in itself or in its relations to other presentations of the inspired word. We look into the Bible and find from beginning to end,—more obscurely, indeed, in the Old Testament, but fully and unmistakably in the New,—the duality of man's nature, as corporeal and spiritual, abundantly revealed. In the account of man's creation it is indicated in language

---

* *The Christian Doctrine of Sin,* by John Tulloch, D. D., pp. 5, 6.

so significant and distinct from that which is employed in connection with the creation of the inferior animals, as to leave the pretended explanations the annihilationist would give of that account wholly without warrant.* And it is everywhere assumed in revelation, just as the existence of God is assumed without formal statement, that whilst the body shall succumb to, the soul, or spirit, shall survive, the stroke of death. That appears in Gen. 9 : 5, where, according to the best Hebraists, as it is said, the word translated "*beast*" (חַיָּה) should be rendered "*soul*"† It is intimated in all such expressions as "when her *soul* was in *departing*,"—"He changeth his countenance, and *sendeth him away*," and where we read of men "yielding up the ghost," and being "gathered to their people," in connections which preclude all supposition of the latter phrase having reference to their burial; whilst in Eccles. 12 : 7, it is expressly declared, as we have seen, that "the dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." It is, of course by the fuller and clearer light of the New Testament Scriptures that all such passages in the Old are now rendered luminous, showing that He who declared Himself the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob" is "*not a God of the dead but of the living.*"‡ And as we turn to the New Testament we find not only the clearest recognition of the soul's continuance in conscious being after the dissolution of the body running through all its pages; but, much more than that, the general character of that future existence brought before us in language so simple, significant and frequently repeated as to make it strange that there should be a serious difference amongst men as to its evident meaning. It is set forth as a state of being in which there is reward for the righteous and punishment for the wicked. In such an understanding of

*With Gen. 1 : 26–28 ; 2 : 7 ; Comp. Numb. 16 : 22 ; 27 : 16 ; Job 33 : 4 ; Eccles. 3 : 21 ; Isai. 57 : 16.

†For the reasons for the rendering see Kitto's Cyclopædia. Art. *Soul.*

‡See on these words Bengel's *Gnomon ;* Stier's *Words of the Lord Jesus,* and Dr. Tayler Lewis's note in Lange on Genesis, p. 214.

the reality and nature of that existence, we hear an apostle saying, "For to me to live in Christ, and to die is *gain*," and declaring himself to be "in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to *depart* and to be *with Christ*," but nevertheless persuaded that to "*abide in the flesh*" would be preferable as concerned the welfare of his brethren, (Phil. 1 : 21–24). We find our dying Lord saying to the penitent thief "*To-day* shalt thou be with me in paradise," (Luke 23 : 43). We read of Judas who "by transgression fell, that he might *go to his own place*;" of the rich man who "in hell lifted up his eyes, being in torments," after he had "*died* and was buried;" that "the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust under punishment unto the day of judgment," (2 Pet. 2 : 9): that the hour is coming in which all that are in their graves shall hear His voice, and come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation;" (John 5 : 28, 29); that the evil "shall go away into *everlasting punishment*, but the righteous into life eternal, (Math. 25 : 46); and many more passages to the same purport, on which we may rightly say, as some one has written, that "the pillars of heaven are no firmer than the foundations of hell." And in the face of the many plain passages in God's word which speak of the *condition in another state of existence* of both the righteous and the wicked, it is not argument, but mere childish quibbling to say, as the annihilationist says, that we find nowhere in the Bible the expressions "immortal soul," undying spirit, etc. To all such quibbling it is sufficient to answer, in the words of Dr. Bartlett, that the sacred writers "never tell men so little as the bald fact that they shall exist hereafter: they tell them a great deal more; they tell them abundantly *how* they shall exist." And all the efforts of even the most ingenious materialists who have sought to explain away the meaning which lies on the very surface of these inspired announcements, when thoughtfully examined, only serve to recall the familiar fable of the viper and the file.

It has not been practicable, of course, within the limits of

a paper like this, to go into the details of the argument the annihilationists would present, nor is it, perhaps, necessary. If permitted to adapt to our use a few lines from the Introduction to the Review of Strauss, we would simply say in conclusion: "As warfare grows older, battles become shorter. In modern tactics the demonstrated ability to do a thing often makes it unnecessary to do it. To pierce the centre makes the beating of the wings a mere matter of detail." By the considerations indicated in the foregoing pages, without anything of elaborate argument, the Annihilation Theory's centre "is annihilated." Its "wings are not worth saving, and not worth beating."

ARTICLE V.

ASPIRATION AND PERSPIRATION.*

By M. Valentine, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

"And another came, saying, Lord, behold, here is thy pound, which I have kept laid up in a napkin," Luke 19 : 20.

You who are familiar with the picture drawn in this parable, know what came of this man's way of dealing with his lord's money—failure, condemnation, and judgment. The point on which his failure hinged was the fact that he used the napkin the wrong way. You see this the moment you note the fact that in the original the word for napkin is *sudarion*, a handkerchief or cloth for wiping off perspiration, a "sweat-cloth." It is only by his *idleness* that the sudarion is found to be, not wiping perspiration, but covering an unimproved pound. It is of far-reaching significance, flashing out the plain explanation of the ill success of much of human life, that the great Teacher represents the unimproved trust wrapped up in a *sudarion*. It sets forth a truth for all ages. When you penetrate the sure import of things, you will understand that there will always be found neglected talents

* A Baccalaureate Discourse, delivered June 22, 1879.

wherever the sweat-cloth is not employed for the brow. The equations of this case of loss and gain—which proved a case only of loss—are that the *sudarion* unused equals responsibilities unmet, no labor becomes equivalent to failure and loss. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," is the law for all the fruit that is sweet to human taste. It means that the napkin must be for "the face," for the sake of the pounds with which men are to occupy till the Lord come.

It seems to us that the truth thus set, as in a picture, before our view, is eminently suitable for your attention, young gentlemen, in this closing hour of college instruction and counsel. There are, indeed, some other themes quite as much to our taste and worthy of the hour. It would be pleasant, for instance, to look at the honorable range of life for which your education has prepared you, the brilliant prizes which our times open to the attainment of young men, and the duty of aiming high and cherishing lofty aspirations. But we are profoundly convinced that the importance of always joining perspiration, or what that word stands for, with aspiration, or high visions and longings, justifies the giving of this high hour to emphasizing this condition of success in life. There are, of course, other conditions and elements of success, some perhaps more primary than this—such as a well-disciplined mind, integrity of character, faith in God through Jesus Christ, and true piety of heart; but this for which the *sudarion*, rightly used, stands, is so necessary to make all others effectual, or carry them into their true results, that it may well be looked upon as justly claiming this prominent attention. We do not at all assume that this class needs this reminder and counsel more than any other, but only *as* every other—human nature always needing it, and not less when entering college than when leaving it. When we see how many comparative failures there are, from want of the nerve of hard work, among those who go forth to the task of life; how many fall below expectations and achieve nothing worthy of their endowments and possibilities; when we note to what impotent conclusions scores of talented and educated persons come, summing up as small and unprofitably as this

"other" of the parable, and from the same reason, we feel fully warranted in believing that there is here a lesson that many had need to learn, but did not.

I. There are a few great, deeply fixed principles, that, however well known, need to be recalled at this time and made more tangibly real to your minds and impressive to your hearts. They are thrust naturally before your view by this subject and by your present position as about to pass forth into the high and earnest responsibilities of life.

1. One is that each and every man is charged with a trust to administer and improve. It may be viewed as an aggregate of trusts. For it is not simple, but almost infinitely complex. Its separate parts are as manifold and diverse as are all of each one's talents, advantages, opportunities of enlargement to himself, good to others, help to the cause of God, and of truth and righteousness in the world. And yet it is so individual and personal, that it is assigned to no one else on earth. Every human being is intended to have a character of his own, to be what no other is, and do what no other can do. In your bodily structure there is created a full organism that, strictly individual, is to fulfill a purpose utterly intransferable. In your soul, of intellect, sensibility, and will, with their full circle of powers, you have been constituted a distinct person, for a separate life, career and mission, that, unless fulfilled by you falls forever. You are, each, one ship built for the ocean, and freighted with a life and possibilities that none else can carry to the eternal shore. There is a space or domain in God's plan given to each of you, in sublime individuality of occupancy and responsibility—never entered before you, never to be entered by another. The poetic idea of Coleridge for his mariner, is strict truth as to the sphere for each of you—you are "the first that ever burst into that lonely sea." Thus every person from the start stands for something, represents something. It is said of Bias, one of the Grecian sages, at the end of his career, that he was himself the treasure that a whole life had gathered. Every man, even at the threshhold of life, stands for all the wealth of being, and blessing to others, that may come of the

high endeavor, the patient care, the thousand struggles and holy labors completed at its close. Toward this end for which you stand, your whole being is framed, as a seed of corn is framed for growth, or a harp for music. Your adaptations and possibilities look toward it, as blossoms look toward fruit. Truly, this must be a holy and responsible thing,—since you have been thus constituted for it, a thing so sacred that no mortal under the sun has right or power to take it off of you, and you yourself can resign it only through the crime that plunges into the suicide's hell.

2. Further, that in its more precise *meaning*, as you begin already to catch it, this trust is *capital for enlargement and service.* It is not for itself, not for the mere sake of "keeping" it, not that the time of life may be spent with and through it. The "pound" is for what can be done with it that will make the world happier and richer and be the faithful servant's joy and power as well as the Lord's glory, Men often act as if they felt they met all their responsibility and were fully justified, when they have simply abstained from directly perverting their endowments to wrong and injury, or sinking them to nothing by the wasting action of foul and destructive employments. If they can at last unwrap the original pound, all innocent of dirt and wrong-doing, from an unsoiled napkin—they think this enough. But the true and deepest import of every trust, in its aggregate and in each part, is as a *starting* point out of which to make something. It is a chance, a privilege, with grand and blessed possibilities on the one side, and solemn responsibilities on the other. To *do* nothing with it, to create nothing out of it, to enlarge it not for your future self or the holy ends of the Master of all, to hand the pound back, even still clean, from the wrappings in which it has been kept idle—this is the loss of all and thrusts into outer darkness. The "unprofitable servant" is the "wicked" servant, because *profitableness* is the very heart of the commission given him. Idleness sins in its very idleness. *Non-productiveness* with the given pound defeats the very end of the gift. The barren fig-tree cumbers and dishonors the ground whose possibilities it brings to nought. Each man is started

in life with a wondrous capital. No one is insolvent at the beginning. It is then, indeed, as all beginnings properly are, only in germ, in bud, in opening bloom, in potency and promise. But if he work not the possible into the actual; if through unexerted brain or inert hands, he improve not his chance, satisfied simply to hold his own as given, he will find that he has not held his own, and must end in shameful bankruptcy. He comes to insolvency, when, out of a divine capital, he makes nothing for his Master or himself.

3. Still further. It is to be recalled that nothing more is required, for the full meeting of responsibility, for the highest worthiness of life and the most blessed results of joy and honor, than simple *fidelity* to *what is given*. Your true success and honor are not in having *receive*d much, either of talent or advantages. Many a young man has been gifted with brilliant endowments and the happiest advantages, and yet has soon sunk dishonorably out of sight, never coming to more than half a man, or some smaller fraction reduced to lowest denomination. But even the humblest trust, faithfully and earnestly administered, lifts up to opulence, joy and honor. And it is *according* to fidelity. One pound may grow to five or ten, and open the gates of five or ten cities. The rich fruitfulness of the right use of what is given is pictured glowingly, enough so to become a kindling inspiration, in the increase from one to ten, and in the exaltation into sovereignty over ten cities, with all that that means. "Because thou hast been faithful in a very little"—all this! The capability developed by faithfully handling a pound, prepares for rulership over municipalities and powers. Men need not envy angels their loftier endowments and sublimer ranges of trust. This working faithfully in lowly scenes and humble services, is as holy and excellent a thing as to glitter and flash near the throne of God. It is as dear to God. Angels may go forth on missions upon lofty ranges, and out through circuits that enclose the orbits of stellar worlds and systems, exercising gifts proportioned to their lofty place. But there may be something of as true moral beauty, and even higher inspiration than is given them, in making blessed results out

of little capital, and climbing up toward the stars by treading faithfully and meekly along the humble paths in which our contracted mission is appointed, and where all that is given may at first be wrapped up in a napkin.

II. Now the central truth, to be emphasized this morning, comes here into clear view, that *energy, hard work with all onr various faculties*, is the essential condition of this blessed outcome of our life-trusts. *Whatever* be your endowments, your mission, or your possibilities, they all wait on this one thing—earnest, faithful, diligent handling. This is, indeed, an old truth—as old as the mountains. But if thousands of years old, it is emphasized by thousands of years of enforcing experience. Yet it is a truth which each new generation has to learn afresh. Multitudes never learn it, or only half learn it, and fail to make it a vital law for themselves. It comes into clear *view* best by looking at the several chief respects in which men are called to "occupy."

1. First, as to *self-improvement* or making actual the possibilities of power, capability and character to which your endowments point and call you. There are undoubtedly differences in the original talents given men, sometimes more sometimes less. All wood is not of equal grain. Some marble is of finer texture, greater strength, and capability of polish than other. Some ores are richer than others. So the original amount and material put into the young, are very unequal. Their chance for bringing it out is unequal. Yet what each is to become, depends largely on himself. If his "pound" be of even the firmest wood, or finest marble, or golden ore, without work it will not come to its true value or excellence. College education does not complete the proper improvement —only begins to show the grain, the texture, or the metal, and hints at what may be made.

By the very *nature* of the case, it is only through its own energetic exercise that the mental and moral life given you can be developed. Not arbitrarily, but by law of natural consequence, the unfaithful lose right to and hold of what they have. They come to an incapacity to keep it. It is by the

effort and stretching and struggle of work, bringing out the mental and moral forces, that a man really grows, makes himself strong and adds stature to his manhood. So soon as a man suspends his self-culture, or carries it on with only nerveless or broken purpose, he ceases to be a growing man, and falls behind his true standard and chance. Man is not like a young tree which may simply be put into place, and the enriching showers, warm sunbeams and fanning breezes make it great. He must work his growth from within. We all know that there is enough of inertia in human nature—even in the young whose life has the heat and ardor of fresh blood—to make this faithful self-culture a labor of no easy sort. Many tire and faint before they win a diploma. And in later years, with that in hand, there are so many obstacles to be surmounted and difficulties conquered, so many syren influences to be withstood and so much toil persevered in, even to the end, that only a high purpose, perennial energy and severe work will succeed in bringing you to your true and best self. Let it not be supposed that this continuous self-culture means that you are to make self-culture your sole or even chief life-work or employment, selfishly devoting your time and energies to your own improvement. A man becomes very small when he retires wholly within himself, in efforts, like private gymnastics, to make himself either great or good. The broader work in which self is forgotten, furnishes perhaps the grandest part of personal self-enlargement and elevation. But the work must be worthy, if it is to enlarge and enrich. Thousands of men are busy till they go to their graves; yet go there very small. There is such a thing as a toiling idleness, that fritters away time and expends the mental and physical energies in trifles, or worse than trifles. There is labor that debases. The prodigal son was enterprising enough, but he "wasted" the substance of his soul as well as of his patrimony. In surrender to the consuming endeavors of avarice, to dissipating pleasures, to the gratification, and frivolities of the passing hour, as unsubstantial and empty as the bubbles that are

"A moment here, then gone forever,"

men may live a very busy life, without the least improvement, and perpetually dwarfed in manhood, corroded in character. Men may perspire in the pursuit of phantoms, or fall down exhausted in chasing "will-o'-the-wisps." Part of your ordeal will be, not in nerve merely for doing something, but nerve in holding yourself to only worthy work. For this the tension must be high and relentless. It may be painful. Were the harp sensitive, it might feel pain in being tuned up to and held in concert pitch. Your faculties, more numerous and delicate than the chords of a harp, will *feel* the pain in tuning and keeping yourself up to the true full harmonies for which your nature has been made. But the tension is necessary, and the pain good.

> "Naught unmarred with struggles hard,
> Can make the soul's sinews strong."

But what the nature of the case thus makes plain, all *experience illustrates and emphasizes.* Never yet has folding the hands, sitting still, or simply fitful trying, languid effort, poetic wishing or sentimental aspiration, matured a person's nature into strength, his character into richness, or his life into its full fruitage. Observation and history assure us that every one who has become really capable, efficient and great, a man whose developed power inspires the homage of men, has come to it in the sweat of his face. It makes no difference whether he has dwelt in the frozen North or the liquifying temperature of the sunny South. You need not be reminded of what the famous oratorical power of Demosthenes *cost* him, as the story of it is as well worn as the pebbles he used to train his intractable tongue by the sounding sea. The secret of the great Plato's developed power is all revealed when we see him still, in his eightieth year, elaborating the thought and style of his works. Read the story of the great artists, the Angelos, the Titians, the Raphaels, the Murillos the Dürers of the race; and you see that while they possessed natural talent, it came out in glory only by severe work, persevered in as if they had adopted the motto:

> "To scorn delights, and live laborious days."

You all recall the rugged hardships and exacting self-discipline through which the great hero of the Reformation grew so grandly masterful and effective. Every one sees at once that Newton, though of first-class talent, did not reach the wondrous capability which wrought out the intricate problems whose solution opened the heavens to the familiar occupancy of science, without the preparatory development of hard intellectual work. His mighty industry, to the end, made him so princely among men. Taking examples from our *own day*, and not so towering, you may turn your view to such men as Drs. Storrs and Duryea. Neither of these has gotten the remarkable control of his powers of thought and utterance, as well as ready stores of knowledge, for which each is famed throughout the land, by easy-going, lazy habits, either in college or after leaving it. Go into any community, city or town, and trace back the history of the men who are, to-day, intrinsically ablest at the bar, in the pulpit, in *any* of the professions or callings, and you will find that while many of them were naturally talented and some not, they were by no means born to their present strength, but are what their own labor has made them. Their best genius, which fixed the rank of the most gifted of them, is a genius for a tremendous amount of work, a genius for unflagging industry. This alone can make Lord Bacon's "full man," or give that opulence of ready resources that impresses you as "reserve power," still capable of doing grandly beyond grand things already done. It takes both God and you to make you into your true self. No man has ever been built up high, without the toil of his own architecture. The great men whose intellectual and moral radiance, high upraised, shine over continents or the world, are mainly pyramids of human energy. Not one has gone up by wrapping away the given talents in an unsoiled sweat-cloth.

There is a great deal written about men of genius. They are painted in a sort of supernatural light. They are said to be always in advance of their age; and not only their own, but every preceding age. One has said that "that every possible future is behind them." They walk in history so ma-

jestically; "some like the sun with all his traveling glories round him, others wrapped in gloom, yet glorious as a night with stars." "Onward they pass, like those hoary elders seen in the sublime vision of an earthly paradise, attendant angels bearing golden lamps before them, and above and behind the whole air painted with seven listed colors, as from the trail of pencils." But this is a poetic way of looking at them. Seen in the real prose of life, you learn that, usually, these men, instead of having *started* in such facile movement, with their sky-tinted glories about them, have been children of straitened conditions and sharp necessities, through and up from which they moved by courageous struggles and hard muscle. Many of them were in want and pain, and restraining prison-bars. Amid privations and sorrows, discomforts and sickness, and in darkness that might be felt, they have usually worked right on to the attainment of their standard, enduring much, toiling much; and as they stand colossal and towering at last, the world talks of them, and wonders at them, as geniuses. God gave them three things: good talent, necessities to work, a willingness to work. They added the actual work, and their pound gained its ten, or may be, a hundred.

2. But as truly as for personal improvement, this is essential both to win the legitimate prizes of life, and do your full work for others. There are such prizes to be secured, and there are services due from you for the good of men. What you are to enjoy is only offered to your acquisition. It is yours simply in opportunity. So, too, the good you may do in the world, is an opportunity—and an obligation. "Why stand ye idle?" asks the divine Teacher. "To do good, forget not," comes the apostolic charge. Bishop Butler says: "If we give more of our time and of our attention to ourselves and our own matters than is our just due, we are taking what is not ours and are guilty of fraud." Sir Thomas F. Buxton says: "No man ought to be convinced by anything short of assiduous and long continued labors, issuing in absolute failure, that he is not meant to do much for the honor of God and the good of mankind." It is not enough, to go through life

living to ourselves, doing no harm to any body, not lying, or murdering, or swearing. We must do something to help on the earth. The world needs, and is waiting for, the outcome of the pound given us. If the space it was meant to fill and bless becomes a blank through our neglect, and the useless talent is found in our hands, must we not be rated as the "unprofitable servant," to be sent into the "outer darkness that punishes guilt? But the energy of a perspiring industry *will* both win the true prizes of life and finish our work. And nothing else will. The Micawbers, of the world, or of the Church, ever waiting for something to turn up, will not win much, or accelerate the earth's beneficent progress. No one ever looks for much to be won or done by the inert, fickle, nerveless, or indifferent, the easy-going or self-sparing—by the representative lounger of the street corner, by the loafing occupant of store-boxes, or the loiterers who puff smoke and time away about the town cigar shops. You do not go to such points or among those who give this direction to their endowments, to find the mechanic whose increasing skill is earning money and attracting favor, or to find the farmer whose acres are gowing wider and richer, or the merchant whose business is prospering and home is filling with comforts, or the physician whose careful skill and fruitful knowledge is attracting extensive patronage, or the lawyer who is climbing, loaded with business, up the ladder of success, or the minister who is impressing his community with the quickening touches of his power. None of these are hunted for there—except by those who are partners in the business of folding away God's capital of life. Diogenes, with his candle, searching for a "*a man*," would not raise his eyes there. If you want to see the men to whom the successes of life fall, and who are of positive value to the world, you must not go among those either who have been daintily trained in ease and softness, who, possibly expecting an inheritance of wealth, have developed no sense of self-dependence, no energy, no industry, or in whose nature there is no worthy aim or earnest purpose, doing everything they do slightingly, or such as, cherishing a fastidious impatience of ignoble toil,

keep their soft hands and soft brains clean of the undignified thing, and only inflate their lives with easy longings and sweet aspirations after the beautiful and nice. Building castles in the air has prevented many a man from getting a house on the ground. Everywhere men have opened the gates into their successes, only with the golden key of labor. Recall Dante, composing his immortal poem in exile and suffering, toiling upon it in intense devotion till he grew lean by the work. Think of Pascal taking twenty busy days to write one Provincial Letter, and you have a revelation of the care and perseverance of labor that has won the world's attention to his writings. His brilliancy did not win fame, by taking it easy. Jean Paul Richter was a man "sumptuously and marvellously endowed." But he rose to success by urging on his efforts in extreme poverty and tireless industry, pursuing his studies, it is said, amid the jingle of household operations. In his unsubduable purpose, he says of himself, in reference to this: "I cannot help saying to poverty, Welcome! so thou come not at quite too late a time. Wealth bears heavier on talent than poverty. Under gold-mountains and thrones who knows how many a spiritual giant may be crushed down and buried." Think of Newman, whose Concordance of the Bible was for a century the most perfect work of its kind, making that volume by the light of pine knots in his cottage at Rehoboth. Without industry in hard conditions, Benjamin Franklin would never have touched with power the life of this country or lifted himself into lofty position. Without vigorous work Daniel Webster's vigorous talent would never have written his name high in our history and engraved it on America's rocks. If you will look into the study of Albert Barnes, morning after morning, an hour before day-light, and see his brain working and pen driving, while other men slept, you will see an explanation how he has put into thousands of libraries that long row of Bible commentaries which have made his name familiar through Christendom, and are explaining the Gospel around the world. If you will look into the laboratory where was spent one of the busiest of English lives, you will understand the reason

of that wondrous success that has made the name of Faraday renowned wherever science is cultivated. As explanation of the great career of Lord Brougham, Justin McCarthy says: Not merely had he the capacity for labor, but he appeared to have a passion for work. His restless energy seemed as if it must stretch itself out on every side seeking new fields of conquest." But why should I accumulate examples? These are but mirror cases, in which the law of success and achievements is reflected. You can see its operation every day in our ordinary life. In many cases of grandest usefulness, there has been no remarkable endowments, except the fund of working energy. But whether much or little, it grasps prizes and does good only as it is subjected to this law. The man whose success and usefulness sum up most satisfactorily and honorably in any calling —in the pulpit, in medicine, at the bar, in teaching—is not usually the one who brings to college the most brilliant talent and trains it most conspicuously in avoiding work, but he who there and afterward continues most energetic and steady in worthy effort, and wraps up no talent in his napkin, but makes it tell by putting the napkin to his earnest brow. Even the plodder will thus often run ahead of the genius, and stand on "the shining hills of day," while his competitor is away below in the shadows of the ridges. Humbler talent should feel the cheering inspiration of this fact, and act nobly in the faith of great possibilities. Want of shining gifts or the best conditions, should never dishearten you. Strong will and assiduous industry can actualize apparently extravagant aspirations. Never allow yourself to be one of those yawning complainers who say: "Oh, if I only had a chance!"—one of those whom a popular writer calls "subjunctive heroes, who always might, would, or should do great things" but who make their not doing great things the most conspicuous fact of their lives.

3. There is one other leading relation in which this energetic life is required—in meeting your *obligations to God.* This side of man's relation is not commonly thought to need much tension of purpose or painstaking. Earthly prizes,

secular elevations, with due doing of good and help of holy causes, usually fill out men's conception of life-work. But all duty attains its highest quality and lustre when done as to God and uplifted and blended into the divine sphere of piety. Life is dead till vivified in the life of God, through Jesus Christ. It is low till elevated into living fellowship with the divine thought, plan, and will. It is impressive to see how all the great thinkers of the ages, all the richer spirits of the race, Christian and non-Christian, have recognized that human nature and life must find their centre, rest, strength and excellence in God. We hear Seneca say: "No good mind is holy without God." We hear Fichte acknowledge: "Only the religious eye pierces to the kingdom of veritable beauty." We hear Herder's devotion: "Every creature draws but to Thee and points to Thee." Newton found the harmonies of all being in God. But, in the rush and strife of daily engagements, amid the allurements and temptations of evil, worldliness, vanity and sin, there is so much at constant war with this high side of duty's law, that it is no easy thing to endure the ordeals, and everywhere and always fulfill the whole measure of your obligations to God; so that when He comes to reckon with you, no talent due directly to Him may be found wrapped up in neglect.

III. It has sometimes been thought strange that so severe a condition of 'occupying' our place should be exacted in the order of things—hard that this necessity has been laid on men. Why has it not been made easier? Perhaps you have been tempted to condemn this order as not good. But it is justified by its wisdom. We are not obliged to "vindicate" God's requirements. But this may be shown to be stamped as a wise and loving order of things—something to rejoice in and be grateful for. It all looks to *character* in man; and stands in the fact that he, unlike the clod, or tree, or brute, or a machine, is designed for the lofty sphere of a free, moral being, capable of being trained upward into the image of God. Man is not put to work by a necessity such as rocks the seas, throws water from fountains, makes trees grow, or a pendulum swing uncomplainingly to and fro, but in free

consent to reason and seen duty, in ways and for ends connected with a great and blessed destiny. His work, therefore, takes on character and builds into character. See a few things:—

1. This energy expresses and *exercises faith*—faith in God as worthy of being trusted in His directions, faith in your powers as made competent to effective effort and happy destiny. Doubt weakens, absence of faith becomes paralysis. The soul is growing great and strong as it trustingly aspires and works toward great and good things. Lord Brougham has said: "The word impossible is the mother-tongue of little souls." By the very working which expresses faith, this great element of character gets additional sinews.

2. Thus, too, the glow and health and joy of the human affections are revealed and promoted. It becomes the process of taking duty into your love. All noble beings live much in the affections. In this they come to an elevation higher than the intellectual—the true summer life of the soul. The true crown of right thinking is right feeling—the real diadem of life. When the true affections are trained and raised into a conscious principle, when they are developed and made healthy through the earnest labor that is constantly turning seen duty into life and character, they form the mighty tide that sweeps all your movements on toward eternal joy, intensifying the action of all your faculties and consecrating them. Love to God grows by working for God. Love to all duty grows thus. The servant's wrapping away the pound expressed want of love to his master. It meant: "Thou art an austere man." It expressed want of interest in anything the pound was for. And surely his interest and love would not increase by his guilty idleness. Hardly anything is more degrading and disastrous than for a soul to be becalmed in its own indifference, like a helpless ship into whose sails the living breath of heaven does not press and stir. It can cut no shining way toward heavenly shores. If you, my young friends, wish to rise in blessed character and power, you must cherish earnest feelings, and make them strong by giving them activity in working faithfully out the blessed aims to which they are adjusted. You must give

your *heart exercise.* It will grow richer through the faithful labor you do according to the will of God.

3. More than this. It brings into happy harmony with the constitution of things. Life is activity. Order is activity. Harmony is activity. "God worketh hitherto," and the universe as a "thought of God," is the rhythm of a ceaseless activity. Worlds, thousands on thousands of them, hurry along their great orbits and spin on their axes. The seasons move ceaselessly on. The rivers never stop. The sun lifts the vapors from the sea, and the clouds, as mighty, never-resting chariots, carry the waters over the broad continents. The sap pours up through the trees; the trees add their annual layers of wood. Millions of seeds are bursting and hastening to cover the fields with grass and grain. Could our ears catch the myriad myriad sounds of the never ending activity, it would be found to be the symphony of an infinite working—not a groaning, but the divine *music* of labor and life. Everything is for something, and has something to do. In the life of earnest industry, you come into harmony with the divine plan, into singing unison with the system of being in which you are to move forever. It is only in such accord with God, attained primarily through the grace of Christ, and in thus working out life's plan in Him, that your life attains its true dignity and substantial value. Your career must be estimated, in the end, not by the ease you have enjoyed, the luxuries in which you have indulged, the show and glitter of the circles in which you have moved, but by the help you have contributed to God's purposes and human welfare, to the progress of humanity and the nobler movements of life—by the five and ten pounds of increase which your faithfulness has added to the divine powers that are to go still on working out the gracious plan of God, giving city after city to the joy of the servants of the great Master of all.

Let not all this be interpreted as a summons to over-work. There is a possibility of this—now and then a danger of it. There is a fever in the pulse of our times. Science, invention, trade, business, are on the drive. Gifted and earnest men go occasionally to excess, and force themselves through

an unrelaxed activity that consumes them. Some die from over-work, especially brain-work. But our ordinary man is in little danger. There is little risk in still pressing the call for perspiration. And what is called for is not to turn life into a burden, or break it down by aiming at too much, but to exercise it faithfully in that high vitality which is at once its health and success.

Nor is this blessed fruitfulness of energy to be understood as meaning that a man can achieve any thing he may desire, if he only wills and works hard. The young are sometimes spoken to as if there was potentially in each one of them a Homer, a Raphael, a Milton, a Shakspeare, a Schiller, a Bacon, a Newton, a Daniel Webster, a Rufus Choate, a Macaulay, a Bismarck, a Luther, a Whitefield or anything else he might set his ambition on and work for. You will credit us with no such nonsense. No sculpture can make an Apollo Belvidere out of sandstone. Material is not all equal. Endowments vary according to all the diversity of sphere and service to be fulfilled in life. The system of things calls for its appropriate talent everywhere. And every sphere is divine. God inspired the workmen in gold, silver and brass, cutting stones and carving timber for building the tabernacle, as well as the prophets who declared His will. And the import of this call is, that, unequal as endowments may be, in making the most of yourself and chances, you really make much—a life not lived in vain, but of real and precious service to the earth and joy to yourself.

My young friends, your place is awaiting your work, all that your powers have been made for. You go forth in auspicious times. The earth has moved rapidly these late centuries. From the watch-towers of outlook, the morning of a blessed future begins to be seen. The life of this generation is to prepare for its full coming. The forces at work are mighty and earnest. If it is good to be put under stress of effort, our times are kind. Never have the competitions in every sphere of activity, for every prize, been more bracing. Never have the conflicts between truth and error, good and evil, been more intense. These are days for stalwart man-

hood, for virtue that has nerve, for Christianity that has muscle—days that require strong men, and *make* them strong if they stand in their lot as they should. If ever there was a time when indifferentism did the work and bore off the palms, when God could get much usury from His slothful servants' occupying, that time is now past.

We know that some speak as if there now no chance for young men, that every sphere is crowded, that towering men are all around, filling all the spaces, that discovery has completed its work, invention has exhausted its domains, literature has swept the field of thought and precluded further originality. But this is a mistake. Science is yet on the threshold of its work. Invention has just been hinting of the things that may be done. The realm of thought has possibilities for original literary work as grand and fresh as any that has ever gone into the earth's great libraries. But the difficulty, at best, goes on the false idea, that these brilliant things, in these special and exceptional spheres, is the only or most valuable work that God has for men to do and the earth needs most. The world has always room for the true, competent and earnest man. Never doubt that there is space for you, and for your very best—more space for your best than anything short of it. Lift up your eyes, and you can see the wide field. Open your ears, and you can hear a many-voiced call from every side. There is not a profession that does not need the toning up of consecrated intelligent work and faithful Christian piety. There is not a city, town, or village in which there are not manifold evils blighting the life of men, and needing to be removed. There is not a community where the cause of virtue and religion does not, in scores of ways, want the help of intelligent, tireless Christian men. As long as the conflict between truth and error is to be carried on, as long as society is unredeemed from destructive vices and wasting traffics, as long as corruption and fraud struggle to maintain place in public and private life, as long as there is unoccupied ground for the Church to occupy and higher grades of life to gain for itself and the community, as long as right, and order, purity and goodness

need pens to write and voices to plead, as long as true education has to be maintained against cupidity and ignorance, our free institutions guarded against demagogism and made to yield their true benefits to all; as long as the light of the gospel and the blessings of its civilization need to be extended, in Africa, Asia, the isles of the sea, where millions of men know nothing of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; as long as *money* is to be made for God's work and human welfare, and all the grand agencies and enterprises are on hand, that carry the earth toward the glory whose dawn is now only glimmering on the horizon; so long is there need of the most and the best that you can do.

The institution whose diploma you are about to receive, desires you to make this faithfulness the law of your life. Look on life as something real and earnest, something great and responsible. This does not mean that it shall not be bright and cheery, or in any way wanting in the sweet graces and enjoyments that form a just attraction for all. We wish to take no sunshine from your life, but, if possible, to add to it. There is a temper of mind in which your work may become a burden, a constraint, an exaction, a subtraction from enjoyment. If you estimate and meet your work in a mercenary spirt, counting it as so much given for so much pay, to be diminished to the least possible that will get the pay—this, not only has no joy in it, but is sordid, and becomes a degradation of your labor. You may take even the holiest duties and services, in which you pretend to follow Christ and serve Him, and measure them out in this sordid measurement, careful to do no more good than is paid for. This must make any man mean and joyless. But when you live in the Christian manhood that sees something higher in the ends of your industry than its simple pecuniary returns or honors won, a mission of usefulness to be lovingly carried on; when you do your part not as unto men but to God, remembering that you serve the Lord Christ; when you come into the great truth that the doing of good is in itself the sublimest and most blessed feature of the life you are made for, then you will find this earnest energy and faithfulness full

of refreshing happiness. It will be the health and joy of your powers. You will be kept refreshed by a commending conscience. You will see fruits whose maturing will cheer you. We call you to this, because we wish you to be happy. A spiritless, labor-hating, labor-shunning, inefficient life, falling below its true measure, and coming short of its proper achievement, can never be a very happy one. A life full of loving activity, whose days are gemmed with the deeds of an earnest soul, cannot be unhappy.

After your graduation, young gentlemen, your lives, we know, will move away from us. The spaces will widen and widen, as you go forth to the places your are to fill, north, south, east, west, in our broad land, perhaps beyond it. We ask you not to allow the geographical distance to have any corresponding reality for your hearts. Let the educational home in which you have been trained, be a home from which affection never departs. Bear with you everywhere assurance of the loving interest and earnest good wishes of your instructors. They will ever joy in your honor and welfare. Your steps now are up the morning and forenoon slopes of life. Whether it shall have, for you, a meridian, afternoon and lengthened eventide, is known only to Him who knows all things. In His name and grace let the whole advance be made, — the duties at every point lovingly and faithfully worked out. Be not a laggard nor spiritless. Adjust the harmonies of life to the major key. Thus you will be ever going on from joy to joy. You will have no decline. Beyond the noontide where the slopes are thought to bend downward, you will still be climbing, and climbing, even to the end. And *then*, your life will close but as the setting of the sun which only passes the evening gates to shine on other shores.

"May the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen."

ARTICLE VI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

WARREN F. DRAPER, ANDOVER, MASS.

A Comprehensive and Complete Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament: with an English-Hebrew Index. By Benjamin Davies, Ph. D., LL. D. Carefully revised with a concise statement of the Principles of Hebrew Grammar. By Edward C. Mitchell, D. D. pp. xxxvi.; 752. 1879.

Mr. Warren F. Draper certainly deserves well of all the friends of sound biblical learning. He seems to be on the alert to furnish the very best works in the line of Lexicons, Grammars, and critical Commentaries. His publications rank among the very first of their kind, and are usually a guaranty of sterling merit. To this class belongs the "Comprehensive and complete Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament," now furnished to American Students. Several features commend its general use. It is a model of beauty and clearness in typography, leaving nothing to be desired in this respect. It is difficult to conceive of any great improvement in the appearance of the pages of this volume; and whilst this is not its chief excellence, it is one that will not be despised by those who have occasion to constantly use it. A greater merit is the simplicity and comprehensiveness of the work. We are assured that "*the present edition will be found to contain over a thousand more Hebrew words or forms than appear in Tregelles's or Robinson's Gesenius,* besides incorporating into the body of the work all the grammatical forms contained in Robinson's Analytical Appendix." The whole is arranged on a plan at once simple and natural, and brought within a moderate compass and cost. The irregular and more difficult forms of words are placed in alphabetical order as they occur. There is appended an *English-Hebrew Index,* to aid the student in finding the corresponding Hebrew words. There is also a synopsis or "concise statement of the principles of Hebrew Grammar, for the use of teachers," by Dr. Mitchell, the American Editor. This Lexicon, if it does not wholly supplant the larger ones of Gesenius and Fürst, certainly must largely take their place in general use. We congratulate the publisher upon this addition to his numerous valuable helps in the study of the original Scriptures, and we congratulate the student who is so fortunate as to be the possessor of a Lexicon so convenient for use, and yet so complete. This volume presents all that is really essential to a knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures in the original.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

The Groundwork of a System of Evangelical Lutheran Theology. By S. Sprecher, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Theology and Mental Philosophy in Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio. 8vo. pp. 502. 1879.

It is to be regretted that Dr. Sprecher's long expected work appeared too near the time of publication of the QUARTERLY to admit of more than a mere notice of it being prepared for these pages. The following remarks it is not pretended to offer as any adequate treatment of the work. Such a discussion of its merits may appear at some later date. This notice, however, may do something to call the attention of the Lutheran Church to a book which, whatever may be the final judgment on its value as a real advance in Theological Science, is full of interest, stimulating in thought, and worthy of the careful consideration of the theological student.

The Lutheran Church in this country is to be congratulated that a work of such a character has been put forth by one of her sons. No such considerable enterprise in Lutheran Theology has, as far as our knowledge extends, ever been undertaken in the English language. This we say, not measuring the magnitude of Dr. Sprecher's work by its bulk, but by the largeness of its aim and scope. The age in which we live is an age of monographs and special treatises; the division and subdivision of labor have extended themselves to the field of letters; and the general theologian is a class that has become almost extinct. Dr. Sprecher, however, in his work undertakes to enter the general field of theology. His present volume professes to be no more than the foundation for a system of theology. He calls it a "*Groundwork of a System:*" *i. e.* it but prepares the way. The whole scope of his treatise is but to propound and unfold a *Method* by which theology should be attempted and developed. The method being established, the foundation laid, the author designs that this Groundwork should be followed by a system of Evangelical Lutheran Theology. It is an extensive plan that is laid out. There is something heroic in the projection of so vast a work; in these days of the carving of cherry-stones, and the elaboration of fine mosaics, it is rousing to see a master stretch his canvas for a great monumental work. We only hope Dr. Sprecher may be spared to carry to completion the enterprise in theology for which he has laid so goodly a substructure.

What then is the method propounded by our author? It is very simple in idea and may be put into a nut-shell. His proposition is, that theology, like all sciences, must deal with a real knowledge given in experience. That as natural science has to do with the facts of experience given through the senses, and received as certainties, so theology must find its material in a real knowledge given in the soul's experience, and certified in its sphere to be as real as the facts of sen-

suous knowledge. The natural philosopher knows, for instance, that fire burns because he has had experience of it : on this basis of certitude he builds his science of the material world. But if theology will build with the same certitude, it must have for its material experience as self-authenticating and certifying as the facts given in sense. The foundation of theology must be the certitude of experience.

Such a self-certifying experience he finds given in the great Lutheran principle of justification by faith. That is a real experience, in which the soul apprehending Christ in His justifying work as revealed in the Scriptures, believes on Him, submits to Him, and in that act comes into contact with the living God Himself, and has a personal assurance of salvation ; just as he who puts his hand into the flame has a personal assurance that fire burns.

Here then is a solid foundation, the foundation of a real experience in consciousness. Christ and His salvation are the objects of knowledge ; the Scriptures are the means by which they are brought to our view ; embraced by the act of faith in the sphere of our consciousness they become elements of experience : and so experienced they certify themselves. As St. Paul said, "*I know whom I have believed,*"

Our author shows how this principle is involved in the experience of every Christian believer. In the early history of the Church it was clear, conspicuous ; with the growth of ecclesiasticism it declined ; under the Romish doctrine of the Church it almost disappeared, personal assurance being replaced by the assurance of salvation given by an infallible Church.

This then was exactly the great revival of the Reformation. "With Luther, salvation once more became a matter of *personal* experience, and, together with this, of personal certainty," (p. 82). He quotes largely from Luther's writings to show that this was his view. He depicts also with great force the decline of theology in the post-Reformation period, by reason of the neglect of this principle and the substitution of an intellectual cognition of justification and its related doctrines, in the place of an experience of the principle itself in the life. From this neglect springs the excessive doctrinal precision of the rigid Lutheran bodies, and from this by way of reaction the Rationalistic tendencies of Lutheranism. In the restoration and unfolding of the theology built on this living experience of justification and personal assurance, he finds the mission of the General Synod.

In Part II. he applies the principle of the Reformation, viz., that man can know God and personally commune with Him,—to the great question of the relations of God and man. With much force he points out the incompatibility of the Deistic and Theistic conceptions of God and His relations to man. He shows how in reality but two ideas of God can survive, the heathen idea of God as a force lost in nature, or resolvable into its system of laws, and the Christian idea of God as a

personal, conscious being, at once the Creator of Nature and the life immanent in Nature. This part which treats of the naturalistic tendencies of the age is full of striking thought. He makes us see how steadily all thought is passing into the two opposite camps, on the one hand of Naturalism, which refuses to know any God, but only Nature and its laws, and on the other of Christianity, which believes in the personal God revealed in the Bible and certified in every believer's experience as a communing presence.

These then are the two great ideas of this *Groundwork*.

1. That Theology must build on the experience of the soul in its personal contact with God and its assurance of salvation in Christ; and,

2. That the conflict between Naturalism and Christianity can only be reconciled by showing that the Christian idea of God and man's communion with Him is a veritable, self-certifying experience, as really given in consciousness as the experience of the natural world is given in sense.

Whatever else may be said of this scheme, it is certainly thoroughgoing. It goes to the bottom of things. Is the Christian idea true? Yes, says our author, for we have an experience of it. This is the very test the skeptical world demands: 'Give us proof,' they say. And our author answers: 'Here it is; the Bible says thus and so of God, of man, of sin, of righteousness, of peace; do you verify it by experience.' It is Christ's own method, "if any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine."

A few strictures and we have done.

In the first place Dr. S.'s presentation of the principle he advocates gives it too subjective an appearance. Taking all his qualifications we do not think he is in error; but all the emphasis lies in that direction. We seem to have the Methodist doctrine before us that everything in religion is to be tested by our feelings; that the evidence of God and the divine life lies in our emotions. Against this Dr. S. has not been careful to guard. The truth is he has left the term "Salvation" too loosely defined. Had he determined "Salvation" as Christ defined it in John 17 : 3, as the consciousness of God as a loving, redeeming Father bringing us into communion with Himself, he would have escaped that suspicion of vague rapturous emotion that has become unfortunately associated with the term "assurance of salvation." Just here then is his weak point.

It seem to us, too, that our author has given too much space to his quotations from Luther. They are, in fact, the only tiresome part of the book.

The work, too, loses in force by the diffuseness of the style. It would be more powerful if compressed. The articulation, so to speak, is not visible. We miss the joints that knit the members. The style

does not do justice to the thought. A sharper outline, a more incisive stamp, would have left in many places a noble image engraven on the mind with clear chiseled outline, where now the edge is blurred.

But with all these drawbacks it is a great work. It is great by reason of the largeness of its scope, the originality of its method, the force of its ideas, and the breadth of its tone. There are books from which we may dissent seriously, and yet which kindle thought and expand our views. It is because they have a largeness of treatment: they look out on the world and catch an ampler horizon. Such we take Dr. Sprecher's work to be. It is a serious attempt to put our theology on a broader, deeper basis. It is an honor done the Lutheran Church that he finds that basis in the great principle of her faith and life. C. A. S.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

Through J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by the Rev. John M'Clintock, D. D., and James Strong, S. T. D. Vol. VIII. Pet.–Re. pp. 1086. 1879.

This voluminous and valuable work is approaching completion. The Editor announces his intention to finish it in two years, and to keep within the compass of ten volumes. A Supplement will follow containing such items as have accrued during the progress of the work. With some minor defects, which are incident to all works of this character, this work when completed will be of inestimable value to ministers of the gospel and others who are interested in the varied subjects of which it treats. As an illustration of the amount of information it contains, the present volume furnishes about 40 pages, double column closely printed, in relation to the Presbyterian Churches, about 20 pages in relation to the Protestant Episcopal Church, and about 10 pages in relation to the Reformed (Dutch) Church. We miss some subjects which we have a right to expect. Thus, while there is a fitting sketch of the devoted missionary, William John Pohlman, there is no mention of the Rev. Dr. Henry Pohlman, an older brother, and whose fame was in all the Churches. Many articles in this volume are treated with special freshness. The work will be an immense storehouse of the most valuable materials.

History of the English People. By John Richard Green, M. A. Vol. III. pp. 451. 1879.

It is enough to repeat the endorsement given to the previous volumes of this popular history, and to join in the general verdict in assigning to it the very first place among works of its class. The period treated in this volume—Puritan England, and the Revolution—possesses a special interest. We cannot commend the volume too warmly to those who desire an acquaintance with this most important period

in the history of "the mother country," and the relations to her American colonies during that time.

Readings from English History. Selected and Edited by John Richard Green, M. A., LL. D., Honorary Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. Three parts in one Vol. pp. 444. 1879.

The popular historian has undertaken the less ambitious task of compiling a volume of *readings* from English History, embracing selections from the most popular historians, and exhibiting leading pictures in the history of that people. It cannot fail to interest and instruct. The volume is admirably adapted not only for the young, but for occasional reading.

Annual Record of Science and Industry. pp. xvii.; 715. 1879.

No brief notice can do justice to this volume. As its title imports, it is a record of Science and Industry for the year past, 1878, and every one who desires to know what has been accomplished in these fields should consult this publication. It marks the wonderful progress we are making.

Shakespeare's Tragedy of Othello, the Moor of Venice. Edited, with Notes. By William J. Rolfe, A. M., Formerly Head Master of the High School, Cambridge, Mass. With Engravings. pp. 214. 1879.

Another of the Plays of Shakespeare, edited by Rolfe, embracing everything to make it attractive and to aid in a critical understanding of the Play. These editions by Rolfe have won the highest encomiums from those well qualified to judge of their critical merits.

English Men of Letters. Edited by John Morley.

Edmund Spenser, by R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's. pp. 180.
Robert Burns, by Principal Shairp. pp. 205. 1879.
Goldsmith, by William Black. pp. 152. 1879.
William M. Thackeray, by Anthony Trollope. pp. 206. 1879.

These *English Men of Letters* are deservedly popular. Prepared by writers of ability, they serve both to please and instruct.

How to Get Strong and How to Stay So. By William Blaikie. pp. 296.

This is a small volume on a most important subject. Much of the misery of this life is caused by the neglect of the laws of health. The work is written in an easy familiar style, and if the advice and directions given are heeded will do immense good. We commend this volume as worthy the consideration of all not too old or too wise to learn.

PHILLIPS & HUNT, NEW YORK.

Beyond the Grave: Being Three Lectures before Chautauqua Assembly in 1878, with papers on Recognition in the Future State, and

other addenda. By Bishop Randolph S. Foster of the Methodist Episcopal Church. pp. 269. 1879.

The subject of these Lectures is one of profoundest interest to every human being. However indifferent many seem or assume to be, that indifference cannot change the stern realities. *"Beyond the Grave"* is a region for all thoughtful minds. As Bishop Foster has avowedly abandoned revelation as his sole or sufficient guide, and yielded himself to the speculations of reason, he has been left to roam amid uncertainties. Compelled, in spite of his pretensions, to return to the Scriptures as the only trust-worthy guide in matters of faith, he presents a strange medley of scripture teaching and philosophical guessing. The book is well calculated to awaken interest, but fails to satisfy the careful reader. The admonition of the apostle is needed in reading this volume—"Prove all things."

Normal Outline Series. Outlines of Christian Ethics. By John P. Lacroix, Professor in the Ohio Wesleyan University. pp. 79. 1879.

A Short History of the English Bible, with brief notices of the translators. By J. M. Freeman, D. D. pp. 82. 1879.

These brief, but comprehensive manuals, are designed to furnish readers and students with a clear outline of the subjects of which they treat. They do not profess to be full discussions, but aim to supply in the narrowest compass the leading facts or principles. They will be useful to aid students in fixing the points in the mind, as well as in furnishing the ordinary reader with a general knowledge of the subjects. The former is based on the valuable work of Wuttke, the latter is compiled from various sources indicated.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON.

Through J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

A Summer Jaunt through the Old World; A record of an excursion made to and through Europe, by the Tourgée educational party of 1878. By Luther L. Holden. pp. 646. 1879.

The title of this volume indicates its character and contents. It carries its readers along with a large party of excursionists to and through Europe, visiting very many of the scenes of greatest interest in Scotland, England, France, Switzerland, Germany, Belgium and Holland, Italy, etc. Next to visiting these countries is the pleasure and satisfaction of reading such a volume.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Through J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

The Life and Letters of Madame Bonaparte, by Eugene L. Didior, with a portrait from the studies by Gilbert Stuart. pp. 276. 1879.

Madame Bonaparte's life was one of the most remarkable among famous women. Born in Baltimore, when that city was a small town,

and living to the advanced age of ninety-four, united in marriage with the great family of Bonaparte and repudiated as a wife, mingling much of her time with princes and nobles, her career was one of strange and varied interest. In this volume she is allowed largely to speak for herself, and her numerous letters exhibit the cast of her mind. This biography of one of the most noted women of our times, cannot fail to interest many readers, and secure for the publishers a wide circulation. Whilst we do not admire or commend the character of the subject, it affords matter for instructive study as well as exciting interest.

ANDERSON & LAWSON, CHICAGO.

Epitome of Rev. Dr. Erick Pontoppidan's Explanation of Martin Luther's Small Catechism. Translated from the Norwegian by Rev. Edmund Belfour, A. M., Pastor of the English Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Holy Trinity, Chicago, Ill. pp. 142. 1878.

A partial examination of this explanation of Luther's Catechism, by Dr. Pontoppidan of Denmark, impresses us most favorably. It is characterized by simplicity and directness. The translator has done a good service in rendering it into English. Whilst it may not be what all our English churches need, it is worthy of a careful study by those who are studying to explain and elucidate Luther's Catechism. We thank the translator for a copy.

D. APPLETON & CO., NEW YORK.

Through J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

The Human Species. By A. De Quatrefages, Professor of Anthropology in the Museum of Natural History, Paris. (The International Series). pp. 498. 1879.

De Quatrefages is one of the oldest and most eminent of living Naturalists. He has long carried on his zoological and anthropological investigations with great ardor and industry. His various and able works have made him widely known, and he has long been recognized as a leading authority in the departments of inquiry that have now become perhaps the most prominent field of scientific discussion. The work before us, therefore, naturally attracts great attention. It is a volume of high merit and great value.

The intention of the author has manifestly been to present briefly the whole subject of anthropology, with the conclusions he has reached on the various points of present dispute. The work is divided into ten books, and discusses successively the Unity, the Origin, the Antiquity, the Original Localization, of the Human Species, Peopling of the Globe, Acclimatization, Formation of the Human Races, Fossil Human Races, Present Human Races, and the Psychological Characters of the Human Species. It is easy to see that it thus covers a field of the greatest interest. Quatrefages maintains the unity of the

human species, and squarely opposes and rejects all the polygenistic hypotheses of the day as unsustained and unscientific. With equal emphasis he rejects Darwin's hypothesis of the origin of man, and declares the origination of a species by evolution or gradual transmutation not only unproved, but at variance with the best established facts and principles of science. While he admits that Darwinian theories agree in certain points with certain general facts and give an explanation of a certain number of phenomena, he holds: "But all, without exception, attain this result only by the aid of hypotheses which are in flagrant contradiction with other general facts, quite as fundamental as those they explain. In particular, all these doctrines are based upon a gradual and progressive derivation, upon the confusion of race and species. Consequently they ignore an unquestionable psychological fact; they are entirely in opposition with another fact, which follows from the first, and is conspicuous from every point of view, the isolation, namely, of specific groups from the earliest ages of the world, and the maintenance of organic order through all the revolutions of the globe." The author also dissents from the assertions of Sir John Lubbock and others who represent the primitive condition of man as "a state of absolute barbarism," and declares that "all established facts protest against this conclusion." He declares of tertiary man,—if there was any tertiary man,—"He already has his industries, and this fact alone proves that his mode of life was different from that of the brute." On the subject of the antiquity of the race, Quatrefages goes with those who find fossil man in the tertiary formations. He thinks man has seen miocene times. On this point, however, he admits room for doubt and the need of further investigations. In reading, too, the proofs he gives and accepts, of tertiary man, one can not fail to be impressed with their questionable and doubtful character. The reader is, indeed, struck with the inadequateness of the facts to assure the conclusion, and the easy readiness of the author to believe it. The volume, as a whole, however, is one that is recommended by the sober and yet earnest scientific spirit that pervades it. All who are seeking information on the great questions it discusses should read it, as presenting the views of one of the foremost scientists of the day.

☞A few Notices have been unavoidably crowded out of this number of the REVIEW.